

# The Library

Fourth Series  
Vol. IV. No. 1

1 June 1923

## ELIZABETHAN SPELLING AS A LITERARY AND BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CLUE

By ALFRED W. POLLARD<sup>1</sup>

AS a rule, papers read before this and other Societies set forth the conclusions reached after a good deal of work by a competent person specially attracted to the subject. Other competent persons may carry some of the speaker's points a little farther, illustrate some aspect of the subject which has been overlooked, or correct small mistakes. But, as a rule, the reader of the paper has done the work that wanted doing and knows more about the subject than other people. My own case this afternoon is different. From time to time I have been driven by accidents to take an interest in English spelling during the three centuries from the beginning of the literary activities of Chaucer to the close of those of Herrick. I have acquired some odds and ends of knowledge of the subject, and believe that there is something to be made of it by workers with more leisure and better training for the task than I possess; and so I want to put my very small contribution down on the table in the hope that other members of the Society, more especially some of the Professors of English (of whom we have several, though not so many as we ought), Professors who have students yearning for subjects for dissertations, will take it up and make more

<sup>1</sup> Read before the Bibliographical Society, 15 January 1923.

of it. It is a great pleasure to me that I am being followed by Miss St. Clare Byrne whose paper seems to me to offer an admirable illustration of one of my two main points.

Having confessed that it is only by accident that I have been driven from time to time to take an interest in English spelling, I shall trust to you to forgive me if I become a little autobiographical in the way I try to make my small contribution.

Before I was seventeen I had been helped to love Chaucer by John Wesley Hales, who took some of the Sixth Form work at King's College School, besides lecturing on English, first at Bedford College, afterwards at King's College. With no better training in English than what he gave me as a boy (training in English was not easy to get in those days), I volunteered in 1886 to edit some of the *Canterbury Tales* for Messrs. Kegan Paul & Co's *Parchment Library*, at that time the prettiest set of reprints on the market. I wanted to make my selection popular and as readily intelligible as might be; I rightly distrusted my own power in any way to modernize the spelling without serious loss to the music of Chaucer's verse; so I took the seven manuscripts which had been printed by the Chaucer Society, and by picking out the most modern spelling any of them offered, for every word, I really made a quite prettily spelt text, while still being able to certify in my preface that not one letter had been altered at my own discretion, or without manuscript authority. Professor Skeat did better. He and Henry Bradshaw (who has some claim to be called the founder of scientific Chaucer study as well as of scientific bibliography) used to ply each other with problems in Chaucer spelling, as children ply each other with riddles, and he produced a complete edition of Chaucer's works in the spelling which Chaucer *ought* to have used, and no doubt would have used if phonetics had been properly taught at St. Mary-le-Bow's, or wherever he went to school, and he had been a good little boy, which perhaps he

was not. An *Athenaeum* reviewer, quite rightly, remarked of my selected manuscript spellings that the one thing certain about them was that they were not Chaucer's. You will observe that I am suggesting that this is true also of Dr. Skeat's. All the same I think that his edition of Chaucer is the best spelt book in the English language, and has great scientific value. I used to think my little effort had none, and in later Chaucer work followed the Ellesmere scribe, only checking his excessive fondness for doubling the letter *o*, a trick in which he anticipated the practice of Anthony Munday. But my *Parchment Library* text, while it had no scientific value phonetically, has (I now think) some little scientific value historically, as showing what modern spellings could be picked out of seven manuscripts of the first half of the fifteenth century and what could not.

Let me give a few instances, which may serve as a starting-point. *Imprimis*, very many words in the fourteenth century had a final *e* which was both written and pronounced because it was still grammatically significant; as time went on this first ceased to be pronounced and then gradually ceased to be written. The singular of substantives forming their plural in *ies* almost always ended in *ie* or *ye*, not in *y*, and at the end of a line the *ie* was dissyllabic, almost as *ia* in Italian. Thus of his knight Chaucer says:

he loved chivalrye  
Trowth and honour, fredom and curtesie.

A few words which now end in *ty*, then ended in *tee*, as in *equitee*, *facultee*, *fraternitee*, *honestee*, *jolitee*. In the forms now spelt *-tience* and *-tion* we get almost invariably *e* instead of *t*. Words now ending in *-ness* in the fifteenth century still ended in *-nesse*, i. e. retaining the final *e* which in Chaucer's day could be pronounced. On the other hand, words now ending in *-less*, then ended in *-les* or *-lees*, as

dredeles, waterles, helples, gracelees, hertelees, &c. It may be worth noting that when Shakespeare was growing up forms in *-nesse* were often shortened to *-nes* as if from analogy with those in *-les*, but that before he was dead the tide had turned the other way, and that forms in *-les* were being spelt *-lesse* as if from analogy with those in *-nesse*.

In many words where we write *a* or *o* the fifteenth-century scribe wrote *au*, *ou*, thus dance is daunce, acquaintance, aqueyntaunce; commission is commissioun, religion, religioun; disturb, distourbe. Finally (not to tire you) the combinations *ea* and *oa*, as we use them in great, beat, and bread, in broad and load, were unknown; and *ie* as in field, though it is found in Chaucer manuscripts in fiers (fierce) and also in fieble (feeble), is very uncommon.

I have jotted down these rough notes with quite Chaucerian lack of order, and I am not going to trouble you with details as to the battle between the old forms received through the French and the variants taken direct from the Latin, or the instances, such as debt and doubt, victuals and indictment, where the pedantic spelling and natural pronunciation still both persist: nor again with the rival attempts to distinguish hard *g* from soft by the addition of the Italian *h*, or the French *u*, so that the term for a stranger to whom hospitality is shown could be written either (with Chaucer) *gest*, or *ghest*, or *guest* as we do now. My thesis is that, starting with Chaucer manuscripts, as epitomizing the usage just before the introduction of printing, we can pick out some twenty or thirty points and perhaps a few dozen special words and use these as tests of change. Any one with sufficient energy could first see what had become of them in the books printed by Caxton, and then by testing a dozen books printed in the last year of each decade he could obtain at least a rough idea as to what was happening to the language. Everything has a beginning; even a new spelling. The first editor for whom I ever



wrote, Mr. D. C. Lathbury, who died only last year at a great age, told me once how he and the foreman of the firm which printed *The Guardian* were trying between them to fix a date. Mr. Lathbury said: 'I think it was during the Franco-Prussian war.' The printer replied, 'I don't know about that, Sir, but it was just as we were beginning to drop the "e" in the middle of Judgement.' He should not have dropped the 'e' in the middle of Judgement, but he was the sort of man I want to find.

To examine the spelling of a dozen representative books at the end of each decade from 1480 to 1640 (say a couple of hundred books in all) would be a fairly heavy task; but if the searchers knew what to look for, and the 160 years could be divided into four periods of 40 years each, a most valuable interim report could be issued, and when an approximate date for the appearance of any new form had once been given, it would soon be corrected, if badly wrong. Rules and cautions would be needed. Most of these should come from the philologists, but a bibliographer may contribute a few, inspired by what is known of the ways of printers. The tragedy of Tudor spelling is not that it had no system, but that it had a bewildering number of rival systems, all of which have left their mark on our poor language, which has been further defaced by countless false analogies. We have seen that the same word could be spelt *gest*, *ghest*, *guest*, and by adding or omitting an *e* at the end, we get at least six variants. Now Elizabethan printers, careless as to many things, were mostly careful as to their spacing, and I think most printers would add an *e* to any possible word, or knock it out, or possibly even add or omit an *u* or *h* in a word like *guest* in order to help the spacing. This suggests several points. *Imprimis*, as regards words in which the rival spellings affect the length of the line, the evidence of books in double columns requires to be much more carefully tested than that of books

printed across the whole page. I've lately been reading the 1611 edition of the Bible with a special view to the spelling. In my innocence I was prepared to find it both scholarly and consistent. But Barker and his men cared more for their spacing than for all the bench of Bishops. Remembering Milton's erratum in *Paradise Lost* 'For we r(ead) wee' I expected that in the use of he and hee, me and mee, &c., some consistency would be found. The only consistency is that the form is always preferred which suits the spacing. It is the same with such words as move, spelt sometimes with one o, sometimes with two, and countless other points. A more patient examination might win better results. My most important one was that books in double columns are not as good evidence as to what may be called the printer's natural spelling as those in long lines. Conversely it must be supposed that books in verse should give truer evidence than those in prose, as (at least in all lines shorter than the longest) the printer would be uncramped by considerations of space. This does not mean that only books in verse should be examined. It does mean that where rival spellings co-existed, and the point is as to which was gaining and which losing on the other, the proportions given should be based on a larger number of pages in books of prose than in books of verse, and in books in double columns than in books in long lines.

I think that if a few quartets of dissertationists were set to work on the lines I have suggested their interim reports would really advance our knowledge of the English language of the periods covered, and that it might even lead, when some phonetic device for preserving pronunciations introduced during this period has manifestly failed of its object, to children being allowed to go back to the earlier spelling which now correctly represents our speech. That should suffice to show you that in these matters I am still an optimist. Bibliographically, I believe that such a Report would give valuable

help in determining the order of undated, or untruly dated, editions. On a balance the spelling in the Quartos of the *Merchant of Venice* and *Midsummer Night's Dream* reprinted in 1619 is distinctly more modern than in those really printed in 1600, and I believe that the spelling test would often be found useful, as long as its liability to be disturbed in any particular line by the printer's care for his spacing is duly borne in mind.

Can we go beyond this use of spelling as a chronological test, and use it as a test of authorship? The test could never be accepted as a main one; but in this imperfect world we depend far more often than we like to admit on the faulty method of an accumulation of points of agreement. In any argument of this kind, if other tests are satisfied, to satisfy also the additional test of agreement in spelling must count for something. Miss Byrne will soon be telling us that she thinks evidence of this kind helps the attribution of *Fidele and Fortunio* to Anthony Munday. Mr. Dover Wilson has applied it with notable effect to the problem of Shakespeare's authorship of part of the Riot Scene in the play of *Sir Thomas More*. The postulate which underlies these attempts is that where we find unusually archaic or unusually modern spellings cropping up in a text the spelling of which is otherwise normal for its period, there is at least a *prima facie* case for examination as to whether these spellings may not be attributed to the author. Before Mr. Dover Wilson got to work, or the problem of the authorship of the Riot Scene in the play of *Sir Thomas More* had exposed me to any temptation to partisanship, I had been led to believe that Shakespeare's spelling was more archaic than that of the compositors who printed his quartos. A belief, not yet sufficiently tested, that Francis Bacon's spelling would naturally be not *more* archaic, but *less* archaic—more modern—than that of the printers, confirmed me lately in accepting the typographical evidence as to the order in

which three reprints of his *Essays* all bearing the date 1613, but not necessarily all printed in that year, should be arranged. It seems rational to believe that every time a work by a man educated in a country grammar school was reprinted his old-fashioned spellings would gradually be eliminated, and on the other hand, that when the influence of Bacon's copy was removed, reprints made during the next few years would be perceptibly less modern in their spelling than the original edition. I think there is something to be said for such a working theory, and also for the possibility of testing attributions of authorship in the case of any writer with whom peculiar habits of spelling can be connected. It is in the hope of obtaining more light on the subject from those with more leisure and better qualifications for dealing with it, that I have had the hardihood to invite attention this afternoon to problems in regard to which I am very sensible that I am no more than an interested amateur.

## ANTHONY MUNDAY'S SPELLING AS A LITERARY CLUE

By M. ST. CLARE BYRNE <sup>1</sup>

THE three autograph manuscripts of the dramatist Anthony Munday have had some attention directed to them by Sir Edward Maunde Thompson's comprehensive palaeographical study. What has not yet been pointed out is that these manuscripts provide us with an excellent opportunity for studying the relation of the printed text to the author's copy in Elizabethan times; and that, by virtue of certain peculiarities, they enable us to ascertain the varying degrees of fidelity with which the different presses followed Munday's originals. Mr. Pollard and Mr. Dover Wilson have long since demonstrated by their studies of the Shakespeare quartos that the old theory of the phenomenal carelessness of the Elizabethan printer is a myth. It seems to me that the next step towards an authoritative pronouncement on the subject of Elizabethan spelling must be achieved by investigation from the manuscript end, and by a thorough investigation of the printed texts of representative authors issued by representative presses.

Munday has fortunately left us two play manuscripts and an autograph dedication; a very large number of his printed texts also survive, spreading over just half a century. Obviously, therefore, we have a genuine basis for a consideration of the relation of his manuscripts to his printed texts. It is not, of course, the indisputable basis that a manuscript plus a text printed from it would provide. I hope to show,

<sup>1</sup> Read before the Bibliographical Society, 15 January 1923

10 *Anthony Munday's Spelling as a Literary Clue*

however, that in the case of Anthony Munday we as good as possess the manuscripts of his printed texts, because it is possible to assert that his spelling shows certain peculiarities which are absolutely consistent, and which persist all through his career.

The one thing that it is apparently safe to say about Elizabethan spelling is, that if it were possible for an author to spell a word in two or even three ways in the course of one speech or one paragraph the chances are he would do so. It is, I think, generally allowed that variants such as the *-les* and *-lesse*, *-nes* and *-nesse* endings which are so noticeable in most printed texts may be simply the printer's device for economizing or filling up space in his lines. Variants, however, which have no conceivable typographical reason to account for their presence may be held quite reasonably to be due to the spelling habits—or lack of habit—either of the author or of the compositor. The difficulty is to decide to which of these two possible agents the spelling of a text is to be credited, and that is where Munday's manuscripts help us.

The date of the latest, the autograph dedication to *The Heauen of the Mynde*, is 1602; he was then in his fiftieth year. The dates of his two plays *John a Kent* and *Sir Thomas More* are not known; years ranging from 1586 to 1598 have been suggested for the latter, and it is generally allowed that the former is probably considerably earlier than its inscribed date of 1596. It should, however, be fairly safe to say that the manuscripts, between them, cover at the least a period of a dozen years. It is therefore, I think, reasonable to assume that any spelling peculiarities common to all three and constant in all three may be taken to have remained consistent throughout Munday's life. As his spelling in general is unusually regular and consistent this can hardly be called a rash assumption.

The peculiarity which at once catches the eye of the most

casual reader of these manuscripts is Munday's use of a doubled medial vowel in such words as looue and woorthy, woorke and forth. The spelling in both his plays is remarkably 'normal' and modern except for this doubled -o, which occurs in the following words: *John a Kent*: afford (1), doone, misdoone, vndoone (15), dooth, doost (14), forth (15), mooue (2), prooue (11), reprooue (2), woorth (13), woorship (3), woord (12), woork (4), looue, loouers, loouely, loouing, beloou'd (46); *Sir Thomas More*: approoue (1), aboard (1), abooue (4), boorde (3), dooue (2), doone (14), doost (3), dooth (13), vndoone (1), forth (5), looue, &c. (22), mooue (3), remooue (1), prooue (6), sword (2), woork (2), woord (8), woorship (4), woorth (4), woorthie (6), woorthily (1). In the 1602 dedication the following appear: woorship (2), woorshipful (1), loouer (2), looue (1), woorke (1), abooue (1). Also consistently used in all three is the spelling freend: fourteen times in *Kent*, sixteen in *More*, and once in the dedication. I have grouped this spelling with the -oo ones because, like them, it is consistently preserved throughout, secondly because it is a word of frequent occurrence, and thirdly because during Munday's life it was a more old-fashioned spelling than friend and frend, the -ie form being decidedly more in favour in practically all the texts and manuscripts I have examined. The *N. E. D.* classes the -ee spelling as a fourteenth- to sixteenth-century form, and does not consider that it passes into the seventeenth.

There are but three exceptions to this list I have given: the word love occurs with a single -o at l. 743 in *Kent*, and wordes with a single -o occurs at ll. 41 and 663 in *More*. This doubled medial -o may therefore, I think, fairly be called a 'real' peculiarity of Munday's spelling—real because it is constant in Munday and is not constant in any other contemporary manuscript that I have yet been able to examine.

Some proof to support the latter part of this last statement will be required. The manuscript of *Sir Thomas More* makes



## 12 *Anthony Munday's Spelling as a Literary Clue*

a good specimen for examination, as it contains Munday's hand and also those of five of his contemporaries. Addition I has moove, worth, doth, proue, loude, loues, or one example out of six; II has doone, forth (2), proue—one out of four; III has aboue and vndonn; IV has donn, woorme, frend, loving (2), worthiest, love, worthy, word (2), wordes, doest—one out of twelve; V has affords and bourds; VI has doun, loues, loving. Hand D has removing, remoued, afoord, doon. These proportions are typical of the average manuscript.

Queen Elizabeth, in the autograph portions of her translations of Boethius, Plutarch, and Horace (1593 and 1598) has frendz, aboue, worth, wordes, workmanship, moued, worke, doth, moue, workes, word, wordz, loue; she keeps consistently to this single-vowel spelling, and similarly in her letters we get done, move, lovinge, frend, but no examples of the doubled form.<sup>1</sup> Further corroboration can be found in Ellis's *Original Letters of Eminent Literary Men*. The two things about Ellis's selection which are at once obvious are, firstly that all the writers, both early and late, tend to use the normal modern form practically consistently; and secondly that in comparison with Munday's their spelling is very 'bad' and irregular. Two other manuscripts of a very different kind which I happen to have examined are Harleian 6910 and Harleian 4286;<sup>2</sup> these show practically no trace of the doubled forms. The same is true of Francis Thynne's spelling (see Lansdowne 27 (36) and Addit. 11388), of Kyd's (Harl. 6849 (218)), and of Lansd. 98 (1), *The Ereccion of an Achademy in Llondon*, perhaps in the handwriting of Sir Humphrey Gilbert. It is similarly true of Harpsfield's manuscript *Life of More* (Harl. 6253), of the spelling of Topcliffe the recusant hunter (e.g. Harl. 6998 (31)), and of those earlier writers Ascham and Wilson who

<sup>1</sup> See Ellis, *Original Letters*, Nos. 201, 225.

<sup>2</sup> The portion at the end of the first book, containing copies of sixteen well-known poems

might well be expected to use the -oo (e.g. Lansd. 3 and Harl. 6992). In these two latter and Harpsfield, indeed, I have not so far found a single example of the double form.

Having therefore shown that Munday's manuscripts reveal a consistent use of the double form, and having suggested that there is reason to believe that the generality of other Elizabethan manuscripts will be found to use it only as an exception, it remains to examine Munday's printed texts in order to see how far the compositor preserved this idiosyncrasy of spelling. I have examined a good many of his texts from this point of view, and the results fall into three fairly distinct divisions, which correspond roughly with the three date divisions of early, middle, and late, or *c.* 1580-90, *c.* 1590-1600, and after *c.* 1600.

Those texts which preserve the -oo spelling consistently and those which preserve it with only a few exceptions all group themselves in the early division. Two specimens of these are *A Courtly Controuersie between Looe & Learning* (1581) and *A Breef Aunswer made vnto two Seditious Pamphlets* (1582). The former preserves the following spellings without a single exception: looue, loouer, looued, looueth, loouing, belooued, freend, freendly, freendship, foorth, doone, dooth, dooinges, approoue, prooue, prooued, mooued, vnwoorthy, woonted, woormes, woorship, woorke, woorde, woorthie. The latter preserves the following with only two exceptions: looue, foorth, dooth, approoue, prooue, reprooue, vnreprooueable, woordes, mooue, Roome, woorkes, freend, Foorde, Oxenfoorde, woonder, vnwoorthy, woorship, woorthilie, woorth, woorthy, woorshipful. The exceptions are a single instance of worthy and one of worshipful. Among other texts which place themselves in this division are *Zelauto* (1580), *The English Romayne Lyfe* (1582), and *A Discouerie of Campion* (1582).

In the second division are those texts in which the proportion of -oo spellings is on the whole higher than in the average

#### 14 Anthony Munday's *Spelling as a Literary Clue*

text—i. e. roughly about 50 per cent. Examples of these are *Palmerin d'Oliua* (1588), *A Banquet of Daintie Conceits* (1588), and *Gerileon of England* (1592).<sup>1</sup> The first has, in the title-page, &c., and Chapters I–III inclusive, the following: affoordes, doone, dooth, freendly, reprooued, moooue, remooue, used consistently, as against a similar use of worth, worthie, and worthilie; three instances of belooued and looue as against seven of loue, one instance of woord as against two of word, and one each of foorth and forth. Chapters XLII–XLIII show a consistent use of foorth, doone, moooue, affoordes, dooth, remooued, freend, as against a similar consistency in wordes and aboue; only one instance of looue as against seven of loue and beloued, and one of woorthie as against two of worthy.

The third class consists of those texts in which the modern form has obviously been accepted by the compositor as the 'normal' spelling, and in which only a few stray specimens of the doubled spelling are preserved by mistake. Almost any of Munday's later books are examples of this class, although there are still some with rather a high percentage of the old form, which to my mind shows the strength of the tradition of literal accuracy in setting-up, as the average text of this date which has given up black letter seems also to have given up these doubled vowel forms.

In order to test these results I have examined a varied assortment of Elizabethan texts which I happen to have had to consult during the last few months. I also examined the products of John Charlwood's press in particular, in order to decide whether this -oo spelling, when a constant factor, might be merely the fad of some compositor. The answer to this inquiry was quite indisputably a negative, as any one can quickly satisfy himself. Charlwood printed the majority of

<sup>1</sup> The two romances I have naturally not examined exhaustively, as I have done in every case unless otherwise indicated.

Munday's books between 1580 and 1590,<sup>1</sup> so I give a brief summary of the results of an examination of other books from his press, keeping to the same period in so far as the British Museum specimens allow.

*A Dolorous Discourse of a most terrible & bloody Battell*: 1578 (?): consistent use of modern forms, with three single exceptions, woormes, schoolers, woon.

Bradford's *Two Notable Sermons*: 1581: not many specimens: workes and wordes consistently, but also looue and foorth fairly consistently: moue and mooue used indiscriminately.

Nash's *Anatomy of Absurditie*: 1590: loue and worship used fairly consistently: a higher percentage of the -oo form in worthy, doth, proue, forth, and moue, but a preponderance of the 'normal' form.

Lyly's *Endimion*: 1591: consistent use of loue, aboue, worthy, word, doues, forth, worme, proueth: four examples of doth as against five of dooth and four of moue as against ten of mooue.

Lyly's *Gallathea*: 1592: consistent use of aboue, loue, louer, louely, loues, Doues, worke, worde, proue: five examples of doth as against eight of dooth and doost: one of vndone as against three of vndoone: consistent use of boord and doone.<sup>2</sup>

In no text printed by Charlwood that I have been able to examine have I found the -oo form used consistently, and only in one is it used with anything approaching the consistency of the first class of Munday's books. The observable tendency

<sup>1</sup> i.e. *Zelauto* (1580); *Courtly Controuersie* (1581); *Breef Aunswer* (1582); *English Romayne Lyfe* (1582); *True Image of Christian Loue* (1587); *Banquet of Daintie Conceits* (1588); *Palmerin d'Oliua* (1588); *Palmendos* (1589).

<sup>2</sup> In the only manuscript of Lyly's available in the Museum (Lansd. 36 (76)) there are only two words in which the -oo spelling would have been possible, and in each case the -o is preferred—i.e. proued and done.

## 16 Anthony Munday's Spelling as a Literary Clue

is towards the consistent use of the modern form; the -oo appears to be old-fashioned even by 1580, and by 1600 'loue' and 'work' can certainly be called the 'normal' forms.

Turning to other presses one finds that -oo is, of course, sporadic in a large number of texts between 1580 and 1600; Peele's *Araignment of Paris* (1584), for example, has single instances of woorth, moooue, dooth, moooued, doone, woork, foorth, as against a customary use of the modern form. Barnaby Riche's *Pathway to Military Practice* (Charlwood, 1587) is the most extreme example of its use that I have found, outside Munday. In it looue, approue, loouers, loouing, affoorde, doone, foorth, boorde, belooued, dooth, dooinges, are used practically consistently, although I have noted occasional exceptions, e.g. louing, louingly; these, however, are balanced, as they are in none of the first class of Munday's, by a consistent use of wordes, worst, worthy, workes, vnworthy, aboue, to which I have observed no exceptions.

This book of Riche's is an exceptional specimen, however, and his *Don Simonides* (1584) and his *Aduentures of Brusanus* (1592) show a very much lower percentage of the -oo form—decidedly lower than the books in Munday's second class. So far as I can tell, from the manuscripts of Riche available in the Museum, the -oo form is not a peculiarity of his spelling. In the two pamphlets on Ireland (Lansd. 156) he uses word, worth, worthy, vnworthy, loving, and Rome, consistently; but as these words are the ones which appear in this form in *A Pathway to Military Practice*, it is perhaps not safe to draw any more general inference.

Having thus collected a certain amount of material, it remains to see what use may legitimately be made of it. The first deduction it suggests seems to me this: that as in the case of several of Munday's books we have sufficient evidence to show that the compositor kept accurately to the spelling of the manuscript before him, in some instances carrying his

accuracy to the very high pitch of preserving throughout a whole book the author's old-fashioned -oo spellings with no exceptions or only those two or three which might honestly be called 'printers' errors', an ideal of *literal* following of the author's manuscript as the rule of Charlwood's printing house is indicated; and if this can be admitted in the case of Anthony Munday and Charlwood's compositors, it should hold good for the average Elizabethan text produced by any reputable press.

The second deduction I am disposed to make has particular reference to Munday: it is, that in a text printed before 1600, and more especially in one printed before 1590, a spelling test can be used to make bibliographical trial of the authenticity of doubtfully attributed work. Exactly how much reliance can be placed upon such a test has already been indicated by Mr. Pollard, and it so happens that the play of *Fedele and Fortunio the Two Italian Gentlemen* provides us with an excellent specimen case for a demonstration of its use.

The attribution of this play to Munday has occasioned some controversy. Its date is 1584, and one of the three extant copies has a dedication signed A.M., as Collier correctly stated. This gives us a good reason for considering Munday's claim, and what other evidence there is all tends to support it. To my mind the spelling of the quarto provides us with a final bibliographical clue to the authorship. The spelling is noticeably 'good' and modern and regular, and as the play is written in verse lines, which, though long, do not often tend to cramp the compositor, there is, as Mr. Pollard has already suggested, an extra reason for us to believe that the printer will have been likely to follow his author *literatim*. The proportions of the -oo spellings in this text appear to me therefore to be really significant. They are as follows: affoord (1); dooth and dooing (21) as against doth, doeth, dost (11); doon (7) against done (8); Dooou (1); foorth (3) against forth (2); loou (37) against loue (66); moou (3)

## 18 Anthony Munday's Spelling as a Literary Clue

against moue (6); prooue (6) against proue (4); remoue (4); reprove (1); vndone (1); woord (8) against word (9); woorke (2) against work (1); woorthiest (1) against worthy (2) and worth (2); woorst (1) against worst (1); freend (10) against friend (11).

That is, out of a possible 230 there are 101 instances of Munday's habitual spelling. This in itself, although under 50 per cent., is unique for a play of this date, so far as my experience has gone; and the figure is striking if compared with that yielded by Peele's *Araignment of Paris*, printed the same year. More striking still, however, is the distribution of these spellings. From Sig. Bi to Diii there are 82 instances of the -oo out of a possible 105, or 75 per cent. From Diii<sup>v</sup> to Giv<sup>v</sup>—all that is available in the Malone Society Reprint—there are only 19 out of a possible 125, or less than 20 per cent. Looue, for example, which occurs 37 times in the play, is only found once after Sig. Diii. The obvious deduction is, I think, that the manuscript from which the compositor was working had exactly the same peculiarity as we find in Munday's. The compositor appears to have begun with the idea of literal accuracy; it must have been a severe trial to his patience, but he persevered heroically with those -oo's until nearly half-way through; then he seems to have given them up in disgust, only retaining them sporadically when habit proved stronger than his very natural dislike of their clumsiness. I consider that the proportions in which the -oo forms are found in the text give reliable evidence of their persistence in the manuscript, and to suggest that an unknown A. M. had this same fondness for them that Anthony Munday had would be to burden coincidence with more than it can well carry.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> How far Munday may prove an exceptional case my own experience is not wide enough to determine. Two other writers who have left us both manuscripts and texts are Ascham and Thomas Wilson. I have examined a number of their letters to see whether in their cases also there are any spelling



In connexion with Munday's spelling there are two more or less related points which call for some comment. The first of these is the origin of this spelling peculiarity of his, the second its phonetic significance. Munday was apprenticed in August 1576 to John Allde, the publisher then in possession of the famous Long Shop in the Poultry. So far as we know his indentures must have been cancelled when, after some

habits which can be traced in their texts, and which would furnish a basis for such a test of doubtful work—supposing any to exist—as I have tried to apply to Munday.

In his four letters in Lansd. MS. 3 Ascham yields the following noticeable spellings: ientlenes, ientleman, moch, soch, bicause, maners, abrode, whan, emongs, taulke, shooting, frend, yong, word, cold (could), doth, done, love, moving, worthye, forth, doynge, move, wold, folow, shold. Most of these occur frequently, abrode, soch, moch, taulke often coming several times in the one letter. They all occur several times in the first dozen pages of *The Scholemaster* (Day, 1570) spelt exactly as they are in the manuscripts, with the exception of words like love and move which are naturally printed loue and moue. In the letters there are several instances of smaull and caulled; in *The Scholemaster* there is an instance of waulke and of faul for fall. Noticeable also is the compositor's preservation of Ascham's preference for single vowels and consonants in such words as borrow, maner, folow, shooting, caried, sothing, spedelic, dalying, medle. Day's compositor obviously followed Ascham's manuscript with the same care for literal accuracy that we have already admitted in the case of Munday and Charlwood's compositor.

Wilson, unfortunately, provides no such easy clues to follow. Perhaps the most noticeable habit in his letters is a persistent use of y where most writers would have used i, as in Prynce, byl, hynder, &c. This peculiarity Grafton's compositor who set up the *Arte of Rhetorique* in 1553 followed with considerable exactitude. Wilson does not use the -oo spelling in his letters and it is infrequent in the *Arte of Rhetorique*. Grafton's compositor keeps Wilson's spelling Ihon; Kingston's compositor in 1563 alters it to Iohn, and also alters nearly all the y's into i's. Curiously enough, however, the first edition persistently refuses to print soch and moch, for which the letters give us authority, while the 1563 edition as persistently adheres to them. Another noticeable point about this later edition is the increase of the number of -oo forms. My own feeling is that if a case like *Fedele & Fortunio* were to complicate the canon of either of these writers there would be quite a considerable likelihood of our being able to find reliable traces of Ascham's manuscript but hardly of Wilson's.

20 *Anthony Munday's Spelling as a Literary Clue*

eighteen months of prentice life, Munday departed on his continental tour of 1578-9. How much knowledge of printing he acquired we have no means of discovering, but apparently he carried away with him this particular method of spelling. The books of John Alde's readily available in the Museum are eleven in number: one of them is Munday's *Mirroure of Mutabilitie* (1579).

Examining the ten others the following results can be obtained:

*Composition of the moste excellent & pretious Oil called Oleum Magistrale* (1574): dooth, dooing, doon (70), as against doth (4); woork (7) to work (3); abooue (3) to aboue (1); looue (3); approue and prooue (4); swoords (2); woord (2); foorth (3) to forth (1); worthy (6); mouing (1); Roome (1); i. e. 95 to 16. Not to be wearisome, I will omit the details of the remaining seven which agree in their proportions with this book, and merely give their names, and the proportions of the -oo forms found therein. They are *Defence of Death* (1577) (100 to 16); *Two Sermons by Bullinger*, n.d. (126 to 59); *History of the 12 men*, n.d. (151 to 5); *Preston's Cambises* (141 to 18); *Offices of Sheriffes* (1573) (40 to 3); *Orders enacted for Orphans . . . within the Citie of Exeter* (75 to 29); *Heywood's Four PP.* (1569) (54 to 17). In Munday's *Mirroure of Mutabilitie* the proportions are quite different: there is only one exception to the double spelling, or 164 out of 165.

In Coxe's *Short Treatise declaringe the detestable wickednesse of magicall sciences* there are 32 single to 8 doubled forms; and in the *Lamentation of a Sinner made by Queen Katherin [Parr]* (1563) there are 99 single to 23 double, and 50 instances of the use of -u for the -o or -oo in such words as work, worship, word. Similarly in *A good and a godly Prayer*, also printed in 1563, we find loue (4), worthy (1), wurkes (1), wurdes (6).

These last two take us at once to the question of the

phonetic value of this -oo spelling. The extensive use of an -u spelling in such words seems to me to indicate that the -oo was used by a conscientious and old-fashioned writer like Munday either because there was still something of an -u sound remaining in the ordinary pronunciation, or else because old-fashioned people still clung to the pronunciation of their youth. I do not think it can possibly have been meaningless, or merely traditional. Mulcaster in his *Elementarie* (1582) writing of 'Proportion' and dealing with the letter *o* says: 'Or is a termination of some trouble, when a consonant followeth, because it soundeth so much upon the *u*, as *worm*, *form*, *sword*, *word*, and yet the qualifying *e* after *will* bewray our *o*, as the absense thereof will bewray an -u, *storme*, *o*, *worm*, *u*; *lorde*, *o*; *bord*, *u*.' I do not feel as if I had grasped Mulcaster's point, but he certainly suggests that a large number of words spelt with an -o had a distinct -u sound in them. Professor Wyld in his *History of Modern Colloquial English* unhesitatingly accepts this -oo in the printed work of Latimer, Ascham, Wilson, and Lyly as evidence of vowel length. There is always the much-quoted Shakespearian pun to support this, 'Now is it Rome indeed and room enough'; and if the grammarian, Charles Butler, is to be trusted, this pronunciation was still normal in 1633 (*The English Grammar*, Oxford, 1633, Sig. c2<sup>v</sup>), and indeed much later.

In conclusion I will try to state what I have found to be the advantages and the drawbacks of spelling as a test of authorship when applying it to the definite case of Anthony Munday. By thus committing myself I hope to achieve the practical result of eliciting warnings and advice.

In the first place it is, I think, a distinct gain to be able to add to existing methods another bibliographical test. In this imperfect world, as Mr. Pollard has said, we have so often to be content with cumulative evidence in lieu of proof:

22 *Anthony Munday's Spelling as a Literary Clue*

and a test which is independent of the aesthetic prejudices of the critic is always of value. Taking *Fedele & Fortunio* as a specimen case, the usefulness of a spelling test is obvious; it does not 'prove' Munday's authorship, but it provides a final item of evidence which makes his claim as strong as any claim of this kind can be, and stiffens it with some bibliographical backbone.

In the second place there is always the possibility that besides strengthening a doubtful attribution the spelling may suggest an author for consideration in the case of work formerly anonymous. It has, for example, suggested to me the desirability of considering Munday as a possible author of *The Rare Triumphes of Love & Fortune*. It might also, in the third place, act as a useful check when investigating the attribution of anonymous work.

The weak points of such a spelling test are perhaps obvious, so can be indicated more briefly. In the first place it is evident that it can only be really satisfactory when it gives a positive result. For example, the presence of these -oo forms in a text like *Fedele & Fortunio*, not printed by one of the Alldes, seems to me to constitute a strong piece of evidence: I doubt, however, whether it would be safe, especially in the last few years of the sixteenth century, to infer a negative result from their absence.

In the second place there can be little doubt, I think, that the usefulness of this test would prove to be strictly limited by date. For example, though Munday's spelling did not change, certain of those datable changes in the spelling customs of the printing house mentioned by Mr. Pollard were taking place while he was writing, so that there would be little use to expect evidence of the kind found in *Fedele & Fortunio* in a text printed after the first decade of the seventeenth century.

Thirdly, the usefulness of such a test is also to a certain

extent limited by the paucity of literary manuscripts which have been preserved. Without Munday's three manuscripts it would have been impossible to assert that his spelling had a consistent peculiarity. The natural deduction one would make from his printed texts would be that the -oo forms in his early books were due to the conservative habits of the printing house.

Fourthly, there is this possible limitation : that investigation into the spelling of perhaps a great majority of the writers of the period may yield little result to the bibliographer, however valuable to the philologist. Munday may prove to be an exceptional case. Two points, however, would certainly be gained by Mr. Pollard's interim reports. We should be in a position, as he says, to use spelling as a test of date ; and we should know more than we do at present about the relation of Elizabethan manuscripts to the printed texts.



## THE EDITOR OF SIR THOMAS MORE'S ENGLISH WORKS: WILLIAM RASTELL

By ARTHUR W. REED<sup>1</sup>

I HAD the honour of reading in 1917 before the Bibliographical Society a paper on More's brother-in-law, John Rastell, lawyer, printer, dramatist, controversialist, and venturer.<sup>2</sup> Rastell had three children, John, Joan, and William, and as their names occur in this order in his will we may assume that this is the order of their seniority. John seems to have had in him much of his father's restlessness. In the year of the old man's death he left England with Master Hore and a party of gentlemen from the Inns of Court on a voyage to the New Found Lands, which they succeeded in reaching. You may remember that twenty years earlier the elder Rastell had failed in a similar adventure. A very stirring account of the son's experiences is given by Hakluyt, who had it from one of the venturers, and it is interesting to note that whilst old Rastell had been victimized by his seamen, the later expedition was strong enough in the number of its amateurs, gentlemen venturers, to keep the seamen in hand, though they had difficulties. Young Rastell was like his father in another respect; he was a litigious young man. Already before the voyage he had appeared in more than one Chancery suit in that rôle of 'humble orator' in which his father had defeated many a defence, including that of the mariners who mutinied against him in 1517.

Joan Rastell, the second child, became, in or about the

<sup>1</sup> Read before the Bibliographical Society, 19 February 1923.

<sup>2</sup> *Trans. Bib. Soc.* xv.



26 *The Editor of Sir Thomas More's English Works*

year 1522, the wife of More's young friend, John Heywood, the dramatist and singer and player on the virginals.

The third of John Rastell's children was William, the subject of this paper.

All three children were probably born in Rastell's native town of Coventry, whither the father had returned after his marriage to Elizabeth More to fill the office of coroner. Rastell was a man of consequence at Coventry: and there, we know, he entertained More, who later became a member of the famous Corpus Christi Guild.

William Rastell was born in the year 1508 at the close of the reign of Henry VII. His brother-in-law, John Heywood, was eleven years his senior, but More's four children, Margaret, Cicely, Elizabeth, and John, born between 1505 and 1510, were all within two years of his age. As the Rastells left Coventry for London while William was a child, we may assume that he came under More's influence at an early age. During his boyhood the two families lived not far apart in the City, and at their country houses at Monken Hadley and North Mymms they were within easy reach of one another. When More moved to Chelsea in 1524, John Rastell also moved out to a suburban residence. The one built himself a riverside house, the other leased an acre and three-quarters of land on the north of Finsbury Fields and there built himself a house and a stage for plays. William Rastell was then sixteen, and his work in the world was beginning.

I recently came across an unexpected evidence of this. I was trying to fix the date of More's *Life of Pico della Mirandola*. Wynken de Worde's edition is not dated, nor is the date given in the title of this piece in the English Works—an unusual omission—but in the table of the contents it appears as 'about the year of Our Lord 1510', which I thought to be some five years too late. More dedicated as a New Year's Gift the *Life of Pico* to 'my entirely beloved

sister in Christ Joyence Leigh' and Joyence, I found from her mother's will (1507), was a nun in the order of the Minoresses of Aldgate, in the seclusion of whose precincts her widowed mother died. Now we are told by Cresacre More that '*when More determined to marry* he proposed to 'himself for a pattern in life a singular layman, John Picus, 'Earl of Mirandula . . . (whose) life he translated and set out'. I suggest therefore that his New Year's Gift was sent to Sister Joyence Leigh, at the beginning of the year 1505, shortly before his marriage to Jane Colt. It was in the course of some searches at Somerset House into the history of the Leighs that I came across William Rastell. Joyce's eldest brother was bound by the terms of his father's will to secure that the family property in Kent did not fall under the Kentish custom of gavelkind, but pass by entail to the eldest son or heir in regular succession. John Rastell was apparently called in to draw up the will of Joyce's brother, which closes with a list of witnesses headed 'teste me Joanne Rastell sen. . . . manu propria . . . et me Willmo Rastell scriptore huius 'testamenti manu propria'. On 1 April 1525, therefore, William Rastell at the age of seventeen wrote a fair hand and was working under his father in legal practice; but it was a curious coincidence that one should meet the future editor of the English Works of More in this way. Two years later, in 1527, when the ambassadors of France were entertained by Henry VIII and Wolsey, and John Rastell was engaged to devise an elaborate pageant at Greenwich, described in the State Papers as *The Father of Heaven*, William was again collaborating with his versatile parent. In Guildford's elaborate record of expenses, besides the charges of Hans Holbein and others, we find Rastell's account set out in great detail, and from this we learn that William was employed in the preparations of the show for forty-six days at a fee of eightpence a day.

28 *The Editor of Sir Thomas More's English Works*

Now Antony Wood says that William Rastell went into residence at Oxford in 1525 and carried away a considerable foundation in logic and philosophy, but no degree. If this be true, we may excuse him the degree, seeing that he was writing a will for his father on 1 April 1525 and working at a pageant for two months in the early summer of 1527. Meanwhile at Chelsea his cousin, Margaret Roper, had translated Erasmus's *Treatise on the Paternoster* and had it printed, and More had the pretty experience of finding Margaret's printer, Berthelette, accused of publishing a book savouring of heresy.

In 1527 and 1528 it is evident that William Rastell was making his presence felt in his father's printing business. So far as the extant copies of John Rastell's law books enable us to form an opinion, his activity as a printer seems to fall into two periods. There is his own magnificent burst of industry between 1513 and 1517 and there is the less heroic but more attractive output of the years 1527-9 when he had the assistance of his son, then approaching his twenty-first year.

Mr. Proctor's Hand List of John Rastell's books makes the division clear, if we assign, as on good evidence we may, many of the undated books to the later period. I do not, of course, suggest that the books of the years 1527-9 were rather his son's than his own. They bear, as a rule, his well-known device, they are printed from his types, and they show the old man himself to have been keenly active about them. What I do suggest is that John Rastell had an excellent collaborator in his apprentice in law, pageantry, and printing.

Berthelette's trouble with the Vicar-General over the printing of Margaret Roper's little book on *The Lord's Prayer* belongs to a chapter in the history of the Regulation of the Printing Press with which I dealt in a paper I read to this Society in 1918.<sup>1</sup> Wolsey, whose long reign was drawing to an

<sup>1</sup> *Trans. Bib. Soc.* xv.

end, had fought Lutheranism and heresy with the old weapons of the ecclesiastical courts and had not succeeded. These weapons had been adequate in the mediaeval days of manuscript books, but they failed in the new days of printing. Tunstall determined to try other ways of stemming the flow of heresy and he called More to his assistance, granting him a special licence to read heretical books and pamphlets with a view to controverting their errors. More's first controversial work, *The Dialogue of Heresies*, was written in the year 1528 and at once put into John Rastell's hands, who published it in June 1529, by which time William Rastell was of age and about to set up his own press. More was exacting in his demands on his printer, and *The Dialogue*, in spite of the obvious care with which it was set up, has a lengthy list of 'fawtes escaped in the printing'. This scrupulousness on More's part is easy to understand, seeing that his work was controversial, and mistakes were an occasion for the enemy. More would welcome the independence of a careful young printer like his nephew, and he set him to work before September 1529 on what was probably the first book that came from his press, *The Supplication of Souls*. For this, William Rastell used a new fount of beautiful secretary type, and except for some large black-letter types used in his title he carried over none of his father's material. John Rastell had two important works of his own in the press while William was busy on More's *Supplication*, *The Pastime of People* and a *New Book of Purgatory*. The latter, like More's book, a reply to Simon Fish's attack on the doctrine of Purgatory, appeared 10 October 1530. *The Pastime of People*, which was nearing completion in 1529 and appeared soon afterwards, is connected in an interesting way with William Rastell's second book, *Caesars Commentaries*, a text and translation, with interpolated notes of much interest, of those portions of the Fourth and Fifth Books that deal with Caesar's invasions of Britain. In the Introduction to the

### 30 *The Editor of Sir Thomas More's English Works*

*Pastime* the older Rastell speaks scornfully of the legendary account given by Geoffrey of Monmouth of the dawn of British history, and makes the following sound statement :

But Ye oldest writyng yt we rede of any auctor is ye boke of ye comentarys of Julius Cesar which indytyd yt work him selfe at ye tyme when he cōquered this land and made it subiect to the romayns which was xlviii years before the byrth of Cryst. In the which he toke grete dylygēce to dyscrybe the realme in so mych yt he shewyth playnly & truly furst ye form & faciōn of the lād & ye quantyte therof how many myle it cōteyneth every way, how ye greate ryvers ren & also he dyscryvyth ye maner & ye use of the people how be it he spekyth nothīg of Brute nor for al the serch that he made he could never come to the knowledgē how this lād was furst inhabytyd.

We are not surprised then to find that William Rastell's second book has the following title :

Julius Cesars Commentaries / Newly translatyd owte of latin in to Englysh / as much as cōcernyth thys realm of England / sumtyme callyd Brytaine ; whych / is the eldyest hystoryer of all / other that can be found / that ever wrote of / this realm of England / 1530.

This again is an attractive piece of printing. The Latin text is in a neat small roman type, and the translation in the pretty secretary used in *The Supplication of Souls*.

With the Caesar I associate two other undated books of William Rastell's, his translation of Cicero's *De Amicitia*, a book for which I have a particular affection as it rests, handsomely bound, at the British Museum in the same volume as the Caxton Ciceros and the English version of the pretty fiction of *Fulgens and Lucrece* by Bonaccorso of Pistoja which Henry Medwall turned into an Interlude ; the other book is his edition of Medwall's *Nature*. Of the *De Amicitia* it may be said that its careful workmanship and good paper make it worthy of a place in a volume of Caxton's, whilst its secretary type is quite in keeping with Caxton's bolder work and even shows something of the same form and inspiration. Of Medwall's *Nature* this must be said, that it is entirely fitting

that it should owe its preservation to the printer nephew of More who forty years earlier had made a reputation as a young actor when Medwall was a chaplain and he a page in Cardinal Merton's household.

In 1531 we find from the colophon to the *Register of the Writs* that William Rastell had quarters in Fleet Street, but he appears at no time to have adopted a sign or to have used a device. Instead of a device we find in his bigger books after 1530 a dignified title-page with a large arched compartment on columns at the base of which are the initials W. R. It is noteworthy that the law book I have just mentioned was to be bought in St. Paul's Churchyard, presumably at his father's shop, at his own house, and at Robert Redman's at Temple Bar. It is interesting to find that Redman was on these terms with the Rastells, because about this time his name appears on some law books for which John Rastell held the royal privilege. At one time I was inclined to think of him as an intruder—Pynson certainly treated him as one—but perhaps his report to Pynson, 'Si Deus nobiscum, quis contra nos', was justified.

More's first attack upon heretics, *The Dialogue of Heresies*, had, as we have seen, been printed by John Rastell. In 1531 William printed a handsome second edition in secretary, but for the long and laboursome *Confutation of Tyndale's Answer*, he employed a new fount of black letter in which Part I appeared during 1532.

More's Chancellorship was of short duration. He took over the great seal in September 1529 and resigned it on 16 May 1532, and it was during this period, as we have seen, that William Rastell came of age and showed himself to be a printer worthy of his distinguished uncle whose works he was printing. More wrote of his resignation to Erasmus, emphasizing the gracious protestations of the king in acceding to his retirement, and adding a humorous note of satisfaction

that even his adversaries had failed so far to come forth complaining of his injustice. Ill health had something to do with his decision, but we know and his adversaries knew the cause to be deeper seated than that. It was one thing to controvert the heretics whose heresy he heartily hated, it was another to serve in high office a king who was affronting his defence of orthodoxy in act and deed ; it was yet another thing to brave his own humanity by sending heretics to the stake. More's decision was of piece with his character. Though all for a time went well, he was under no delusion as to his position and it is of great interest here carefully to observe the dates and sequence of events. He resigned in May 1532, in September William Rastell was specially admitted at Lincoln's Inn, More's own Inn, and on the following New Year's Day, More's friend Heywood gave to the king a New Year's gift and received one from the king himself. So far the skies had not fallen. The atmosphere at Court was evidently not unfavourable to More at the beginning of 1533. And there is every evidence that during the following twelve months More was fairly free from anxiety, and that both he and William Rastell were hard at work. Indeed the year 1533 was much the most productive year in Rastell's career as a printer. He continued to work at his uncle's *Confutation of Tyndale's Answer*. He printed his *Apology*, his *Letter against John Frith*, his *Debellation of Salem and Bizance*, and his *Answer to (Tyndale's) Poysoned Book*. This last book Rastell finished just before Christmas 1533, but dated 1534, and this seemingly slight inaccuracy was seized upon by adversaries to support an allegation that the book was an attack upon the new *Book of the Articles devised by the King's Council*. More disclaimed this and explained what had occurred. William Rastell had anticipated the New Year by a few days, treating it as beginning on 1 January.

Besides his printing for More, Rastell printed in 1533



*Fabyan's Chronicle* in full. This he may have done by arrangement with the Fabyans whose arms occupy the full page verso of the title leaf. Robert Fabyan was of course dead but there was a John Fabyan, a physician of wealth and literary tastes, living in the parish of St. Clement Danes at this time, who left his English books on medicine and his English Chronicles to Lady Marny in 1541. Whether or not it was he who suggested the new edition, it is obvious that John Rastell's very original adaptation of Fabyan, *The Pastime of People*, had not taken its place. William Rastell's second edition perhaps made amends for his father's rather bold and free abbreviation of the Pynson Fabyan.

Another interesting work of this crowded year, 1533, deserves mention, young John More's translation of the report by the Portuguese Damyan Goes to his friend the Archbishop of Upsala, of the church and commonwealth of Prester John. It is an important little book with an innocently pleasant preface by John More to the reader, the work itself being a literal translation from the Latin of Goes as published by Grapheus of Antwerp in 1532, a copy of which is in the British Museum. In this we learn of the entirely orthodox ecclesiastical constitution of the Abyssinians, and of their well-ordered court and civil life. Young More—he was then twenty-two—emphasizes in his preface the triumphant evidence afforded by this account of the church of Prester John, of the errors of the 'busy brethren', the English heretics. The Portuguese, anxious to secure the approval of the Pope for their oriental projects, laid stress upon Prester John's orthodoxy, and took care that it should be without blemish. Into that, however, we need not go. What is of importance is the question whether John More's preface does not suggest that he imagined his little book to have something of the interest of his father's *Utopia*. There are the conversations in Antwerp, the 'Portyngal' Dandrada, a sort of Hythloday, who has been

to Abyssinia, his account of a fully developed social and religious system new to the West, and the application of all this as a criticism of the social and religious life of the England of the day. What makes this idea the more intriguing is that this report of the church and state of Prester John was first published by the Portuguese to the West in 1513 on the arrival of an embassy from Prester John shortly before More wrote his *Utopia*. It was the visit of a second and similar embassy in 1531 that excited young John More's interest. If we may adapt, however, Euclid's figure of proportion, More's *Utopia* is in literary magnitude to his son's *Prester John* as was the father in magnitude to the son. History has a rumour that John More was not a very robust character.

In addition to his printing for the Mores and the Fabyans, William Rastell found time in this his busy twenty-fifth year for an important piece of law printing. His *Natura Brevium* offered to his fellow students, the gentlemen students of the law, in a minute type the twelve principal text-books of instruction in legal practice. To these were added a carefully compiled index and an address to the aforesaid gentlemen students by William Rastell, himself one of them. The whole book is no larger than a comfortable prayer book, but the type is that distressingly small nonpareil that makes some prayer books impossible. 'Thus have you', says the young editor, 'these XII small books (but conteynynge very great 'lernynge) compacte into one volume, ryght studyously 'corrected.'

This busy year, you will remember, is the one which followed More's resignation of the Chancellorship, and it was not until the end of the year that More's troubles began to close in on him, and these troubles began with a question of dating. William Rastell was called before Cromwell, you will remember, in January 1534 (N.S.) to give an account of the

date of a book of More's. I believe that Rastell rather perversely dated the New Year from Christmas or 1 January because it had a bearing on the important question whether the Papal Brief conveying the dispensation for the marriage of Henry VIII to Katherine was a forgery or not. Since the Papal Briefs dated the New Year from the Feast of the Incarnation, i.e. Christmas Day, the friends of Katherine claimed that the dispensation was good. My only excuse for raising this problem is that it has a bearing on the dating of the four well-known plays printed by Rastell during this year 1533. I believe that it accounts for the two dates 1533 and 1534 on the two extant editions of *Love*, whilst as Dr. Greg showed twenty-two years ago in *Anglia*, the 1534 edition is the earlier. If that is so, then *Love* was in the press at the time of his trouble with Cromwell, and the second edition shows the correction to 1533. As the *Play of Weather* is a companion volume, the two being alike in form and both printed in black letter, I would place them both near Christmas 1533. The other two plays are in secretary type and they, too, are companion volumes. They are dated 12 February 1533 (*Johan Johan*), which means, on my supposition, 1533 and not New Style 1534, and 5 April 1533 (*Pardonere and Frere*). I therefore place *Johan* and the *Pardonere* within a month of one another and not as they are usually supposed thirteen months apart. That is, I place the two anonymous plays, in secretary type and similar make up, at the beginning of the year and the two black-letter Heywood plays at the end of the same year. If you should ask what a protégé of More's was doing to print plays in the beginning of 1533 which make such free sport of curates, priests, pardoners, and friars, I would reply that More himself has a pretty answer to the objection in a passage addressed to Tyndale in this same year. Tyndale had tried to score a point by suggesting that More's 'derling', Erasmus, in a book written in More's house, *The*

36 *The Editor of Sir Thomas More's English Works*

*Praise of Folly*, had written more than freely of saints and relics and images. 'That Boke of Moriae', says More, 'dothe indeede but iest uppon the abuses of such thinges after the manner of the disours parte in a playe.'

William Rastell's printing ceased when More's troubles began. He had printed his books from a house without a sign in St. Bride's Churchyard, Fleet Street, and I had expected to find his name in the subsidy roll for St. Bride's in 1534. What I found there, however, was that John Heywood had a large house in St. Bride's parish with the high assessment of £40, but that William Rastell's name did not occur. It is not unlikely that he had quarters in Heywood's premises and that the two were under the same roof when the four plays were printed.

The irritating charge against William Rastell and More in the matter of the New Year's dating of 1534 was followed up in February by the charge against More of holding communication with the nun of Kent, and when he had at length cleared himself of that, there followed the charge to take the oath of Supremacy. On 17 April 1534 More went to the Tower, and William Rastell, dropping the now dangerous craft of printing, devoted himself to the study of law. He was joined at Lincoln's Inn on 25 July 1534 by John Heywood's brother, Richard, who was present a year later as a law-clerk at More's trial and is mentioned by Roper as one of his authorities for the account he gives of the proceedings. William Roper and Richard Heywood were close friends and lifelong associates. They became legal partners in the office of Prothonotary of the King's Bench and shared quarters in Lincoln's Inn. In this year 1534 of More's imprisonment, and Richard Heywood's admission to Lincoln's Inn, John Heywood was playing the game by cheering the seventeen-year-old daughter of the superseded Queen Katherine. The birthday song *Give place ye ladies* ends with the lines :

This worthy ladye to bewraye  
A king's daughter was she  
Of whom John Heywood's lyste to say  
In such worthy degree.

And Mary was her name, weete ye  
With these graces induede  
At eighteen years so flourisht she  
So doth his meane conclude.

On the other hand, old John Rastell had been won over to the side of the Protestants by the young scholar of Christ Church, the martyr, John Frith, a charming, witty, and lovable enthusiast. In re-reading one of Rastell's law suits I came across an unrecorded fragment of a lost book by Rastell on the dorso of a sheet of depositions. It is all that remains of Rastell's second reply to Frith. It is headed *The cause why that Rastell made his boke of purgatory without aleggyng any textes of holy scripture*, and it opens with the phrase: *I marvell gretely that my broder Fryth doth hold this*. . . . Frith's reply is still extant, but this fragment is all that exists of Rastell's treatise.

The story of his estrangement from his family and the More circle and his unfortunate end were told in my earlier paper on John Rastell. More does not mention him in any of the letters and treatises that he wrote in his confinement. 'A good man and a very properly lerned man,' one of his friends called him, but his ill-balanced enthusiasm and perversity were at length laughed at and he died in prison neglected, caught in the web of the spider, for he is the Fly and Cranmer the Spider of John Heywood's *Spider and the Fly*. Rastell's alienation from his own people is marked by the completion in July 1534 of the conveyance of the family property in Warwickshire to the Wygstons of Leicester, and thus the old connexion of the Rastells with Coventry was severed.

The imprisonment of More began on Friday, 17 April 1534.

and he remained in a confinement that grew closer as time passed. He was executed on Tuesday, 6 July 1535, fifteen months later. It is probably to the piety of his daughter Margaret Roper that we owe in the first instance the preservation of the writings and letters that belong to this period. Cresacre More tells us that she was imprisoned after her father's death and 'was threatened very sore because . . . she meant to set her father's works in print'. Of these last works of More it is not easy to speak as one feels. Their cheerful courage, strong conviction, and genuine simplicity are as impressive as their freshness and ready wit. 'Farewell my deare childe', he wrote to Margaret on the day before he died, 'and pray for me and I shall for you and all your friends that we may merely (merrily) meet in heaven.' Seriousness in More was not sadness. He would have loved George Herbert for his wit not less than for his saintly life. It is doubtful if, when More's English works find a second editor, the controversial works will please many readers, but they are too full of good things to remain out of our reach. The works of the imprisonment, however, are not controversial, and they are a great achievement. In one of the Holbein groups of the More family is shown a Boethius, a favourite book with the household. More's *Comfort against Tribulation* is his own *Consolations of Philosophy*. I sometimes wonder why it is not better known in English homes. It is a cheerful book, not without the interest of playful reminiscence. More's heaven is a place of laughter and mirth. They that sow in tears 'shall have in heaven a merye laughing harvest for ever'. *Comfort against Tribulation* was, as we shall see, the only work written in prison to be printed before the great volume of the English works appeared, but it had to wait for the accession of Mary.

A year after John Rastell's death in prison in 1536, his widow, More's sister, Elizabeth, died. She appears to have

found an asylum in John Heywood's house with her daughter Joan, to whom she left 'her ring of gold with the great red stone' and all her personal belongings. Her son William was her executor. More's other sister, Joan Staverton, who lived in widowhood from 1538 to 1542, appointed John Heywood her executor and left her best bed to William Rastell, who in the year of Mistress Staverton's death married Winifred the young daughter of Dr. John Clement. It is not without significance that More's widowed sisters placed their last trust in the keeping of John Heywood and William Rastell.

More had married his children prudently. The Ropers, Herons, Danceys, Allingtons, and Cresacres were all wealthy, and More did not involve any one but himself in his own deliberate act of conscience. Yet he appears from one of his last letters to his old friend, Antony Bonvyse, the wealthy Italian financier of Crosby Hall, to be expressing gratitude for something more than their old intimacy and Bonvyse's many generosity. It would seem as if the old Italian had set More's mind at rest as to the security of his disciples, if not in England then abroad.

William Rastell was called to the bar in the Trinity Term of 1539, and he prospered. He was now thirty-one. He had already at the age of twenty-six closed his career as a printer, and in that craft he had done really distinguished work. He had also already edited by that time an important law book for the gentlemen students of the law, and had prefaced it with a dignified and business-like preface. His work had marked him out as a young man of character, great industry, cultivated taste, and unusual ability. He had an orderly mind, the inflexible will of the Mores, and their singular loyalty in friendship. And now he prospered. As evidence of this we have the records of his purchases of land in 1542 when for £80 he acquired property of over 100 acres in North Mymms in Hertfordshire, and for £200 messuages and land at Tottenham,



the latter interestingly enough from John Heywood and his son-in-law, Christopher Stubbes. Heywood himself too had prospered, as this property indicates, and it was probably Heywood's purchase in 1540 of land in North Mymms that led William Rastell to buy an estate there. And this year 1542 was the year of William Rastell's marriage to Winifred Clement, the daughter of More's most brilliant disciple, John Clement, who, we learn from More's address to Peter Giles, was present as a boy in Antwerp at the birth of *Utopia*. Clement had married Margaret Giggs, More's high-spirited and learned adopted daughter.

It was probably William Rastell's new preoccupation in life that kept him out of the trouble that John Heywood, William Roper, John More, Bishop Gardiner's nephew, and the parish priest of Chelsea, with others, fell into in 1543. The story of the plot against Cranmer is told in Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*, Act V, Scene III. Cromwell's death had raised the hopes of the Catholic party who, imagining that they had in the *Statute of the Six Articles* an instrument that would enable them to convict Cranmer of heresy, conspired to secure evidence against him. Cranmer, however, and not Gardiner, was made President of the Commission of Inquiry, and John Heywood narrowly escaped the fate of a Tyburn death. German Gardiner was executed on 7 March 1544, in April John More recanted and was pardoned, but Heywood's fate was in suspense until 6 July. It was in this year and under the strain of these anxieties that More's daughter, Margaret Roper, died and was buried at Canterbury in the Roper's church of St. Dunstan's. How closely the friends of More were concerned in these troubles is indicated by the fact that among those executed was More's parish priest, John Larke, Rector of Chelsea.

William Rastell appears not to have been involved in those things, partly I think because he had just married, and partly

because he was much absorbed as a young barrister in his new responsibilities. He was called to the Bar, as we have seen, in May 1539. In 1541 he is mentioned in the Black Books of Lincoln's Inn as having clerks under him, and his clerks are again mentioned in 1544, the year of Heywood's troubles, as paying 18*d.* a week for their commons 'so that they exercise the larnyngs both wt-in that howse and wt-owt'. In 1545 he was promoted to the office of Pensioner of the Inn.

In 1546 he was Autumn Reader and became a Benchler. He was proceeding rapidly through the stages of promotion in the hierarchy of his Inn. In 1547 he was nominated to examine certain members who had failed in their duties as custodians of the Council Chamber and Library at the Sergeants' Feast, when some one 'spoyled' the meate'. He was, in fact, one of the busiest and most respected Benchers and as such took a leading part in the festivities at Westminster at the coronation of 'the most worthy and indolent Prynce and King', Edward VI. In 1548 he was Keeper of the Black Book, from which these facts are taken, and in 1549 he was elected, in the third year of the reign, Treasurer of the Inn. Then on 2 February 1549/50 occurs the startling entry 'Rastell the 'Treasurer fined £10 because he went to foreign parts without 'leave of the Governors'. He had revolted against the Protestant rigours of Edward's advisers. An Inquisition held at the Guildhall on 27 February 1550/1, a year later, states that he 'deceitfully and rebelliously' took flight to Louvain on 21 December 1549 with his wife and her parents and that his goods and chattels were forfeit to the king. He is shown as the owner of a lease of a valuable messuage named Skales Inn in Whittington College and seven other messuages in the City. His household goods, including seventy yards of hangings, were assessed at a high value, and this Middlesex Inquisition took no cognizance of his Hertfordshire property.

<sup>1</sup> i.e. stole.

Rastell had been preceded in his flight by Antony Bonvyse. For the first three years of Edward's reign London Catholics had been protected by Bishop Bonner, and it was his deposition that led Bonvyse, the Rastells, and the Clements to seek a foreign sanctuary. Bonner was accused of allowing Masses to be said in private houses, and generally of failing to carry out the repressive measures of the Reformers.

Meanwhile, John Heywood, whose elder son Ellis was a young Fellow of All Souls and whose younger son Jasper was a page of honour to the Princess Elizabeth, was constrained in their interest to walk warily. He had narrowly escaped a Tyburn death in 1544 and he ran no second risk. He was a favourite in the young king's household where he was a 'sewer of the chamber'. He was on good terms with Sir Antony Cooke and his learned daughters, and Cooke was one of the king's tutors. Heywood appears to have been intimately concerned in the lighter side of Edward's education, his music and recreations. William Cecil, who married Mildred Cooke in 1546, was also in a position to protect his friend Heywood.

William Rastell was an exile for three and a half years, and during that time he occupied himself in compiling and preparing for the press More's English Works and the important law books that Tottell printed afterwards. In the preface to the most important of the law books, *The Collection of Entrees*, he writes 'This book, which (with such copies as 'I had, being out of England and lacking conference with 'learned men) to the furtherance of the practice of the law, 'I have finished the eight and twenty day of Marche, in the 'yeare of our Lord God a thousand five hundred three score 'and four'. An equally important work, *The Collection of the Statutes*, probably also occupied him, and there is good reason for supposing that he translated his father's *Expositiones terminorum legum*. But a cruel blow fell upon him before his exile was over. Four days after the death of Edward VI, and

before Mary was proclaimed, his wife Winifred died of fever in Louvain and was buried in St. Peter's Church, aged twenty-six; and having laid his wife to rest William Rastell returned to England with his co-exiles, her parents, John and Margaret Clement, and the Bonvyses. Winifred Rastell's epitaph may be read in Pitseus. 'Latinae linguae non imperita, Graecam vero eximie callens, sed moribus et vitae sanctimonia nemini postponienda. Cui (pie lector) Deum quaeso, deprecare propitium.' In November Richard Tottell printed More's *Comfort against Tribulation*.

We next hear of William Rastell from the Black Book of Lincoln's Inn. On Ascension Day 1554 it was reported at a meeting of the Governors:

In this Easter time anno primo Mariae reginae Mr. William Rastell one of the Benchers of this house of Lincoln's Inn gave towards the furnishing of the altar in the Chapel in the Howse, a greate image or picture in a table of the taking down of Cryste from the Cross and two curtains of green and yellow sarcenet for to hang at the ends of the same altar and also a cloth of green and yellow sarcenet lined with canvas to hand before the said altar: which things the said Mr. Rastell gave to have the prayers hereunder written for the souls hereunder specified. Wherefore at the request of the said Mr. Rastell it is at this present council granted and agreed by the whole consent of all the Masters of the Bench of Lincoln's Inn present at this council that at all times hereafter every priest that shall serve in the Chapel shall in every of his Masses that he shall say at the said altar say at the beginning of the Mass before the Epistle and in the end of the Masse, a 'collett' for the sowles of Winifred Rastell wyff to the said William and of all the parents kinsfolks and friends; and also shall in every of the said Masses remember the same souls in the *memento pro mortuis*. Also the said Mr. Rastell did then at his costs for his said wife's soul gild the 'V knoppys' of the canope for the sacrament which cost him 1111s.

*Margin* Hic ordo propter stolidam abhominacionem et superstitionem abollitur ad Consilium tentum 16 Aug., anno regni Dominae Reginae Elizabethae 23<sup>o</sup> (1581).

The next entry in the Black Book is the last. It is to record the presentation of the accounts of William Rastell (now) Sergeant at Law, the Treasurer, and it refers to the customary gift made by the Inn to the new Sergeants.

#### 44 *The Editor of Sir Thomas More's English Works*

We have already referred to Cresacre More's statement that Margaret Roper had contemplated the publication of her father's works. After her death William Rastell had taken over this pious office and carried the works as far as he had then collected them to Louvain. Lest, he tells in his preface to the English works, they should in time perish, unless they were gathered together and printed in one whole volume, 'I did diligently collect and gather together as many of those his works, books, letters and other writings printed and unprinted in the English tongue, as I could come by, and the same, certain years in the evil world passed, *keeping in my hands very surely and safely* now lately have caused to be 'imprinted in this one volume.' We have seen that he had the *Comfort against Tribulation* printed by Tottell at once on his return in November 1553. His preface to the Works is dated 30 April 1557, four years later, and addressed to Queen Mary. I will not speak at length on Rastell's editorial care, the value of the marginal notes, particularly of those explaining the intimate family references in the last letters, nor his attention to accuracy of sequence. William Rastell's work is a monument of loving and loyal care. But I am so bold as to be thankful that at the last moment he added to the 1,428 pages that begin with the *Life of Mirandula* fourteen pages of verses written by Mayster Thomas More in his youth for his pastime, so that the great volume opens with 'A mery jest how a *sergeant* would learne to playe the frere'. This argues a sense of fun in Mr. *Sergeant* Rastell.

Under Queen Mary, William Rastell more than recovered his material prosperity, and on 25 October 1558 he was raised to the Bench, and it is interesting to note that Jasper Heywood was appointed Lord of Misrule at Lincoln's Inn for the Christmas revels of the same year. Young Heywood had already probably finished his translation of the first of his three Senecan tragedies, the *Troas* which Tottell printed in

1559. I know of no better illustration of the rapid advance of Renaissance thought and feeling than the fact that John Heywood's *Spider and the Fly* and his son's *Troas* were only separated by three years. By walking warily in the troubled days of Edward VI, John Heywood had secured for his sons an uninterrupted and sound education, and Jasper succeeded Ellis as a Fellow of All Souls. Nothing in the story of the More circle is more strangely impressive than the manner in which the rings of loyalty widened in succeeding generations. That John Heywood and his old wife Joan, William Rastell and his wife's parents, Dr. John Clement and Margaret Giggs, should renounce their prosperity and again become exiles we can understand; they were More's 'discipuli, familiarissimi'. But before the parents fled from the Elizabethan rigour, Ellis and Jasper Heywood were in Rome, Jasper had become a Jesuit, and Ellis had written his *Il Moro*. One can appreciate the spiritual struggle that John Heywood's grandson passed through, I refer to John Donne, Dean of St. Paul's. The first three years of Elizabeth's reign had passed before William Rastell and the Clements again fled—from Gravesend—to Louvain on 3 January 1562/3, John Heywood and his wife followed on 20 July 1564, and none of them returned. The flight of a Justice of the Queen's Bench to the protection of a foreign sovereign, without licence, was a grave misdemeanour, and a special Commission (anno 4) sat at the Guildhall in October to take an inventory of his belongings, which became forfeit to the Crown. The inquest assessed the value of the personal belongings left in his chambers at Sergeant's Inn where apparently he had lived. The findings begin with a list of some forty odd books, of which half are law books. The rest include a Euclid, a Eusebius, a St. Augustine, an (Erasmus) New Testament in Latin and Greek, a Horace with commentary, a Psalter in Greek, Eliot's Dictionary, an Aeneid in French, a Greek Dictionary, a Cicero

46 *The Editor of Sir Thomas More's English Works*

*de Oratore*, a French Testament, Gardiner's book against Bucer, Euripides in Latin and Greek, an *Illucidarius poeticus*, Adrianus de modo Latinae loquendae, a Bible in parchment, Lucian's Dialogues in Greek, and a Theodore Gasius. The prices named vary from 4*s.* for a book of Statutes from Henry III to Henry VIII, to 4*d.* for the *Olde Abridgement* of the Statutes. The MS. Bible on parchment was valued at 2*s.* Eliot's Dictionary, the Euripides and the French Virgil were 1*s.* each. The *Great Abridgment* which John Rastell priced new at 42*s.* was valued at 3*s.* 4*d.*

Like Chaucer's Sergeant of the Law, William Rastell had many robes. His gowns violet and scarlet and clokes faced with fur, sarcenet, velvet, sable or martin varied in value from £6 13*s.* 4*d.* to 30*s.* His gowns and caps are valued in all at over £30. Then there was the furniture, the beds, hangings, the maps, a bow and a sheaf of arrows (2*s.* 6*d.*) and a corslet with all parts (13*s.* 4*d.*), and finally a *bone wrapt in a canvas* (2*d.*). These things Rastell left behind him in his chambers in Sergeant's Inn, and they probably represent what he was content to leave rather than what he had to leave. As compared with the books, maps were highly priced, a French map and Italian map and a 'universal' map were valued at 12*s.* Relative values may be assessed by the price (2*s.* 6*d.*) of a long seat described as a side form. This was probably a substantial oak form such as we might nowadays pick up second hand for 30*s.* in the country. William Rastell did not long survive his second exile. He died of a fever on 27 August 1565 and was buried beside his wife in St. Peter's Church at Louvain. Men of law are not always punctilious in their attention to their wills, but nothing could exceed the care and skill with which William Rastell negotiated this difficult business. He filed an autograph duplicate copy with the registrar at Antwerp, and had it attested in his own presence on 8 August 1564. Probate was granted to Dr. Clement and Ellis Heywood on



5 October 1565. Ellis he made his heir, leaving him the rents, which he continued to draw while he lived, of William Rastell's lands and houses in North Mymms.

He had, however, purchased from the City of Antwerp a perpetual annuity of 780 florins which he left partly to Ellis Heywood, partly to Bartholomew More, provided that he did not cease to be an exile so long as England was Protestant, and partly to charitable uses. His gold locket with the portrait of More, all his printed books except law books, all his wearing apparel, he left to Ellis Heywood, and he left rings and jewels to all his relatives or friends including his brother John who received a gold ring with astronomical figures that remind us of his father. I have told the story elsewhere of the remaining years of Rastell's survivors in exile and how old John Heywood outlived them all to make upon his death-bed a last merry jest. And now, as I draw towards the close of my paper, I would suggest that it is right to give to William Rastell's edition of the English Works of Sir Thomas More the place of honour among his many achievements. More's influence dominated and directed the life and fortunes of his nephew, and it has seemed to me worth while to gather together the story of their relationship not only because it makes a coherent and inspiring tale but also because it helps us to feel ourselves something of More's influence.

There are two matters on which I should like to add a word before I close. By the courtesy of the Library Committee and the Librarian of Lincoln's Inn, I was permitted to examine the books and manuscripts, bequeathed to the Inn by Sir Ranulph Cholmeley in 1563, the year before Rastell left England. Four of these books had been the property of William Rastell and in one of them is written the note: 'Memorandum that I William Rastell the xvi day of March in the xxx year of kyng Henry the VIII have sold to Randall Cholmeley my fyve gret bokes of yeres wherof this is one for the some of xxxviii*s*. viii*d*. which the same day he hath payd

#### 48 *The Editor of Sir Thomas More's English Works*

'me.' Each of these volumes has Rastell's name in neat Greek characters and many of the manuscript notes are of interest, as for example the reference to William Rastell's reading in 1548 on the Statute *Quia Emptores*. Together they form a most valuable collection of early printed Year Books, the work of Pynson, Robert Redman, Wyer, and Berthelette. The colophons of Berthelette show high spirits. The year book for 14 Henry VII concludes with the hope that it will tickle the most delicate palate. 'By Jove I'm sure that this little volume will not altogether fail to please.'<sup>1</sup> It is a pretty piece of work in secretary dated 1529.

The other matter has reference to the book (or play) of Sir Thomas More. In Hunter's edition of Cresacre More's *Life of Sir Thomas More*, the editor remarks that Roper's *Life* and Cresacre More's *Life* made their appearance from a foreign press soon after the marriage of Charles I to the Catholic Henrietta Maria, and that the parties interested in More's justification had to wait for safe opportunities of exalting his reputation. Thus in Mary's reign we have Ellis Heywood's *Il Moro* and Rastell's great folio edition of the English Works; but although Roper's *Life* existed in manuscript along with an anonymous life now in Lambeth Library, it was not until 1588 when Catholics abroad hoped for the conversion of England through the Armada that Stapleton's *Life* appeared in his *Three Thomases*. It was this work of Stapleton's or one of the anonymous manuscript translations of it that offered to the compilers of the play the material for a chronicle drama, but it is obvious that a play which exalted the reputation of More must have been politically dangerous. Indeed, it is surprising that it was submitted for Tilney's approval. I think, however, that there may have been a More tradition kept alive by Sebastian Westcott's Paul's Boys. Westcott succeeded Redford as master of the Paul's Boys in 1547, and

<sup>1</sup> Scio per Jovem non omnino displiciturum hunc libellum.

in spite of his well-known Catholic loyalty and Grindal's vexation, he remained a favourite of Leicester and the Queen and died at St. Paul's in 1582. Now Sebastian Westcott was a friend of William Roper whose will he witnessed in 1576; he belonged to the same set as Roper, Richard Heywood, and Justice Sowthcote and their legal associates, and their wills indicate considerable intimacy. We thus have a line of dramatic interest direct from More's own day when John Redford was Master of the Paul's Boys. Such a tradition might account for the retention in the play of a characteristic repertory of Early Tudor Interludes including a *Wit and Wisdom* play, for John Redford wrote *Wit and Science*. My suggestion then is that the play as we have it is based on Stapleton but that in it is embedded dramatic material belonging to a More tradition kept alive by the sturdy Catholic Sebastian Westcott for the enjoyment of his legal friends.

## WILLIAM CAXTON'S STAY AT COLOGNE

ON Monday 19 March, before the reading of Mr. Gordon Duff's paper on *The Fifth (1638) Edition of Burton's Anatomy*, which will be printed in the next number of *The Library*, Mr. A. W. Pollard announced on behalf of Lieut.-Col. J. G. Birch the discovery in the register of aliens at Cologne of four entries of permission given to William Caxton to reside in the city for successive periods, subject in each case to a prescribed notice before leaving.

The first entry is the second under the date Wednesday 17 July ('mercurij xvij Julij') in the year 1471 and reads (expanding contractions in the Latin):

Wilh. Caxton uyss Engelant ad mensem cum resignatione iij dierum.

i.e. there is a grant to Caxton to reside for a month subject to giving three days' notice of departure.

The second is the second entry under Friday 9 August ('veneris nona Augusti') and extends the permit to Christmas:

Wilhem Kaxton vsque nativitatis christi cum resignatione viij dierum.

When three days' notice was demanded Caxton secured renewed permission to stay while he had still eight days left; when eight days' notice was needed he obtained his third permit on Wednesday 11 December ('mercurij xj x<sup>bris</sup>') while he had still a fortnight in hand. This third entry runs:

Wilhem Kaxsum uyss Engelant usque Johannis Baptiste ut supra cum resignatione 8 dierum.

17

Monday 17 July

By Andrew and Christopher (son)  
ad munc ad munc up d

\* North off the lamp of Jorg in munc  
North Carston off munc ad  
munc ad munc

First Entry. 17 July 1471

Monday nona Auguste

(L.)

Elbigen Carston off munc ad munc 88

Second Entry. 9 August 1471

— 11

mony v̄ r 67

\* willhem kington off england  
 npx volyn kington n̄ w̄ d̄ 67  
 Johan van vinda npx pape  
 w̄t goyden n̄ d̄ 67

Third Entry. 11 December 1471

2

mony

17

mony

112

\* willhem kington off england  
 n̄ ad medid d̄ 67

Fourth Entry. 19 June 1472

Lastly, the fourth entry, applied for on Friday 19 June 1472 ('Veneris xix Junij'), only five days before the feast of St. John Baptist, secures a final extension of another half-year :

Wilhem Kaxton uyss Engelant continuatum ut supra ad medium annum cum resignatione viij dierum.

It was pointed out that the importance of Colonel Birch's discoveries was considerable. Caxton states in the 'Incipit' of the *Recuyell of the Histories of Troy* that the translation was 'ended and fynnysshid in the holy cyte of Colen the .xix. day 'of septembre the yere of our sayd lord god a thousand foure 'honderd sixty and enleuen', i.e. some six weeks after he had obtained his first extension of leave to reside until Christmas 1471. What did he intend doing at Cologne after he had finished his translation? It had already been suggested by Mr. Duff that the date 19 September 1471 must be taken in conjunction with Wynkyn de Worde's verses at the end of his edition (c. 1495) of Trevisa's translation of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* of Bartholomaeus Anglicus, where he writes :

And also of your charyte call to remembraunce  
The soule of William Caxton, the fyrste prynter of this boke  
In Laten tongue at Coleyn hymself to avaunce  
That every well disposyd man may thereon loke.

Mr. Duff identified this Latin edition printed—or partly printed—by Caxton at Cologne with the edition by the printer known as the printer of *Flores Augustini*, and the identification has been generally accepted. But the only date connected with this printer is that of 1473 found in his edition of the *Dialogi decem variorum auctorum*. From September 1471 to the beginning of 1473 is a gap of fifteen to eighteen months, according as the year is reckoned as beginning at Christmas or Lady Day, and this was rather awkwardly long. Colonel Birch has now neatly filled it up by proving that Caxton came to Cologne in July 1471 and stayed there until some date



within six months after Midsummer 1472. This exactly suits the identification of the edition of the *De Proprietatibus* printed by him with that from the press of the printer of the *Flores Augustini*, and there can now be no doubt that Caxton learnt his craft at Cologne and not in the Low Countries. William Blades always doubted this on the ground that if Caxton had learnt to print at Cologne he would have printed better, especially in the matter of making his lines end evenly. It had already been pointed out that several of the early Cologne printers were by no means perfect in this respect, and the printer of *Flores Augustini* was one of them.

### THIRTIETH ANNUAL MEETING

THE thirtieth Annual Meeting of the Bibliographical Society was held at 20 Hanover Square on 19 March 1923 at 6 p.m., the President, Mr. Thomas J. Wise, in the chair.

The minutes of the last annual meeting were read and confirmed. The Annual Report and Balance Sheet were read by Dr. McKerrow. Their adoption was moved from the chair, and carried unanimously.

On the motion of Mr. Redgrave, seconded by Mr. Madan, the President and other officers of the Society were re-elected for the ensuing session.

On the motion of Mr. Jacobi, seconded by Mr. Barnard, the following were elected as Members of Council: Mr. R. A. Austen-Leigh, Dr. E. Marion Cox, Messrs. Lionel Cust, E. H. Dring, Stephen Gaselee, J. P. Gilson, M. R. James, C. W. Dyson Perrins, Sir D'Arcy Power, Messrs. A. W. Reed, Frank Sidgwick, and Henry Thomas.

## JOHN OF BASING'S 'GREEK' NUMERALS

By W. W. GREG

**M**R. ROBERT STEELE, in his most learned little book on Arithmetics lately issued by the Early English Text Society, touches incidentally on a matter about which I have long felt curious, and which would perhaps repay further study than, so far as I know, it has yet received. After remarking that most probably the forms of 'our present' numerals are derived from Greek sources through the so-called Boethian "apices", which are first found in late 'tenth-century manuscripts', he proceeds: 'Another Greek form existed, which was introduced into [western] Europe by John of Basingstoke in the thirteenth century, and is figured by Matthew Paris; but this form had no success.' I hope to show in a moment that John's innovation did not fall quite so flat as Mr. Steele seems to imply, but a few words must first be said about Matthew's account of it. The passage in the *Chronica Maiora*, which relates the remarkable achievements of John of Basing or Basingstoke under the date 1252, is well known, but the description is not free from difficulty, and the whole account is so interesting from various points of view that I venture to give it at length as it appears in Archbishop Parker's manuscript, which is believed to be partly autograph (C.C.C.C. no. 16; ed. Luard, 1880, v. 285):

Diebus insuper sub eisdem, ne mala veniant inconcomitata, magister Johannes de Basingestokes, archidiaconus Legrecestræ, vir quidem in trivio et quadrivio experientissimus, Græcis ac Latinis literis ad plenum eruditus, viam universæ carnis ingressus, gemitus et lacrymas multiplicavit comitis [Simonis] memorati. Hic magister Johannes intimaverat episcopo Lincolniensi Roberto, quod, quando studuit Athenis, viderat et audierat ab peritis Græcorum doctoribus

quædam Latinis incognita. Inter quæ reperit duodecim patriarchum, filiorum videlicet Jacob, testamenta; quæ constat esse de substantia Bibliothecæ, sed per invidiam Judæorum dudum fuisse abscondita, propter manifestas, quæ in eisdem patent, de Christo prophetias. Unde idem episcopus misit in Græciam, et cum ea habuisset, transtulit de Græco in Latinum, et quædam alia. Hic insuper magister Johannes figuras Græcorum numerales, et earum notitiam et significationes in Angliam portavit, et familiaribus suis declaravit, per quas figuras etiam literæ repræsentantur. De quibus figuris hoc maxime admirandum, quod unica figura quilibet numerus repræsentatur, quod non est in Latino, vel Algorismo, quas huic paginæ duximus protrahendas. Fiat stipes, et in eodem lineas exeuntes, ut quælibet angulum rectum, acutum, vel obtusum faciat, protrahas, hoc modo [and so forth, adding figures and some mystical interpretations: see the table on p. 57.

It will be noticed that two apparently contradictory statements are here made about John's numerals: first that they also represent letters, which is, of course, true of ordinary Greek numerals but not of those figured; and secondly that by them any number (presumably up to some limit) can be expressed by a single (complex) sign, which is true of the numerals figured but not of ordinary Greek. At first sight it looks as though Matthew had confused two different notations, but further examination shows that the statement as to representing letters is really meant to apply to the numerals figured, for later on after reproducing an elaborate symbol (which has no proper significance) Matthew adds: 'Hæc autem figura omnes numerales secundum Græcos figuras complectitur, et omnibus litteris est aptabilis.' This being so, the only meaning I can attach to the statement is that the symbols may equally be used to express letters in some sort of cipher-writing. Since, the alphabetic order once fixed, any numerals can, of course, be used to express letters, just as any letters can be used to express numerals, this statement seems at first futile; it should, however, be observed that the fact that in John's notation any number (up to 99) is expressed by a single sign does give it a cryptographic convenience greater than either the Roman, 'Arabic', or true

Greek system can boast. The origin of these numerals is another matter : whether it is to be sought in ogham writing I do not know ; it seems remotely possible, but can hardly have been known to Matthew.

The system of numeration whose introduction Paris ascribes to John of Basing is one that must have been fairly well known, and was even occasionally used, throughout the later Middle Ages. There seems no reason to doubt Matthew's account of its having been brought to England from Greece ; but though he definitely speaks of it as Greek ('*Figuræ numerales secundum Græcos*'), men like John of Basing and Robert Grosseteste must, of course, have known that it was not the ordinary Greek notation, and they may very likely have believed it to be of eastern origin. Such, we may fairly suppose, was the view taken early in the sixteenth century by Cornelius Agrippa in his second book *De occulta philosophia* (1533), chapter xix. Here, after mentioning the systems of number current among the Hebrews, Egyptians, Aethiopians, Chaldeans, and Arabians, he continues (trans. J. F., 1651, p. 233) : ' Moreover I found in two most ancient books of Astrologers, and Magicians, certain most elegant marks of number, which I thought good to set down in this place ', and then proceeds to describe what is essentially the same system extended for use up to 9999. This notation, however, was not always reserved for occult purposes, and signs agreeing exactly with those given by Agrippa are used to number the openings of a German fifteenth-century manuscript in my possession, *Liber dialogorum sancti Gregorii*, &c.<sup>1</sup>

The passage in Matthew's *Chronica Maiora* may perhaps

<sup>1</sup> The same notation is given by Joannes Noviomagus in his first book *De numeris*, chap. xv, Paris (and Cologne ?), 1539. He calls the numerals astrological or Chaldean and cites Rodolphus Paludanus Noviomagus as his authority. From this work they are reproduced by Matthæus Hostus or Hostius, *De numeratione emendata*, chap. ix, Antwerp, 1582 (and 1572 ?), who calls them astronomical numbers.

afford the clue to a puzzle in another manuscript belonging to his own century and to his own abbey of St. Albans. This is Royal MS. 14 C. vii in the British Museum, a volume really consisting of three distinct works, namely: *A*, the *Chronica Minora* or *Historia Anglorum*, Matthew's own abridgement of his larger work, extending from 1070 to 1253; *B*, 'tertium volumen' of the *Chronica Maiora*, 1254 to 1259, really the conclusion of the Parker manuscript; and *C*, an anonymous St. Albans continuation, 1260 to 1272, in a late fourteenth-century hand. Like the Parker manuscript of the *Chronica Maiora*, the present *Historia Anglorum* is believed to be partly autograph: it contains a bare record of John of Basing's death in 1252. The recent Catalogue of the Royal Manuscripts duly notes that the gatherings are 'numbered at the end, with catch-words, and marked with peculiar figures on the second page of the first five or six leaves'. It does not, however, mention that what I may call the authoritative numbering at the foot of the last page of each quire (I<sup>o</sup>-XIII<sup>o</sup>) extends to the end of *A* only, whereas the 'peculiar figures', which constitute a regular if cryptic set of signatures at the foot of the first verso of each sheet (*arcus*) of the quire, run through both *A* and *B*. They were, therefore, added later than the authoritative numbering in *A*, but before the accession of *C* to the collection. These 'peculiar figures', some of which are red and some black, so far as I can discover are perfectly arbitrary signs, and some of them are repeated at irregular intervals. Now, it seems possible that certain of these signs are derived from the numerals described in the *Chronica Maiora*. Thus we twice have a cross (which does not stand for ten) and twice an arrow. These two signs (with the respective values of 55 and 33) are specially selected by Matthew for mystical interpretation, 'quasi ab æterno provisæ'. And if it be objected that Matthew's cross is upright (+) while that of the signatures is saltire (x), I must

# MATTHEW PARIS: MS. C.C.C.6.16

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90

## GERMAN XV CENT. (& CORNELIUS AGRIPPA)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90
100	100	200	300	400	500	600	700	800	900
1000	1000	2000	3000	4000	5000	6000	7000	8000	9000
	1610	1511	1471	2308	7887	9999			

## SIGNATURES IN MS. ROYAL, 14 C. VII

I	(lost)	VIII	8	[xiv]	8
II	f	IX	9	[xv]	9
III	III	X	X	[xvi]	10
IV	4	XI	3	[xvii]	a
V	5	XII	12	[xviii]	12
VI-VII	6	XIII	0	[xix]	X

point out that Matthew particularly remarks of this 'most worthy' sign that 'qualiter volvitur idem signat'. Again the sign which is written like 'f' may well be derived from that for thirty; while another, a circle with a tail to it, which occurs with modifications no less than four times, closely resembles the sign which in the later developments of the system stood for ninety-nine. This suggests that from the first more than one variety of the notation may have been recognized, and that at least some confused remembrance of these mystical 'Greek' numerals may have lingered among the monks of Matthew's own abbey in the generations after his death.

In order that readers may judge for themselves of the likelihood of these speculations I reproduce herewith the various notations involved. I need only add that the symbols given in Parker's manuscript are obviously incorrect: in the sign for nine the line should make an obtuse angle with the stem (*stipes*), while in that for seventy it should make an acute angle. Agrippa writes the signs upright like Paris; otherwise his symbols only differ from those here shown in having a short line instead of a dot for 5, &c., and a square instead of a semicircle for 9, &c., variations which suggest that he followed a slightly more archaic tradition. If the first quire of the Royal manuscript was ever signed all trace of the signature has disappeared; the seventh evidently never was signed, it is an irregular gathering of three leaves only.



## CHRONOGRAMS

By W. H WHITE

**W**HAT is a Chronogram ? That is the question which nine people out of ten would ask themselves on reading the title of this paper.

It was the almost accidental purchase (from a book-barrow in the Farringdon Road) of one of the late Mr. James Hilton's books on Chronograms which awakened my interest in the subject, and a quotation from it will be the best definition or description of a chronogram that I can offer.

A chronogram then 'is properly a sentence or a verse, wherein certain letters express a date, while the sentence itself is descriptive of, or allusive to, the event to which the date belongs'.

The date itself is expressed by roman numerals, these letters being distinguished from the others by being printed or carved of a larger size, so that they stand out as capital letters in the middle of a word. Here is a specimen : the motto on a medal struck in honour of Gustavus Adolphus, king of Sweden.

CHRISTUS DUX ERGO TRIUMPHUS

Christ our Leader : therefore a Triumph. The date given is 1632, the year in which the king fell at the battle of Lützen. The result is reached by adding the numerals :

C	=	100
I		1
U		5
D		500
U		5
X		10
I		1
U		5
M		1000
U		5
<hr/>		1632

Here is another chronogram from a tract in the British Museum. It is a better one than the first, because it brings in the Hero's name :

gUSTAVUs ADOLPHUs GLORIOSE PUGNANS MORITUR=1632

To explain the art of making chronograms, something must be said on the system of the roman numerals. The most striking feature in this is the small number of symbols employed. We have in arabic numerals separate symbols for every figure up to 9, and by the addition of ciphers we can multiply any of those figures by ten, a hundred, or a thousand almost indefinitely. But the Romans appear to have used only six symbols for all numbers from 1 to 1,000 : i.e. I (1), V (5), X (10), C (100), D (500), and M (1,000). All other numbers have to be expressed by combinations of these, the combinations in the forms with which we are familiar frequently being shortened by the use of 'reversals' so that IIII is written as IV ; VIIII as IX ; 1495 as MVD, and the like. These reversals cannot be used in chronograms, since in chronograms the numerals are not arranged in the order in which they would be in writing a date straightforwardly, but as they are needed to spell the words. Thus for the date 1843 we must use the long form MDCCCXXXIII, not MDCCCXLIII, because in a chronogram where all numerals have to be added together, at their own value, neither more nor less, XL would be exactly the same as LX, namely, 50 plus 10, or 60, and thus the chronogram would give the date as 1863 not 1843. Moreover, since X is a difficult letter to introduce, two V's are often substituted for it.

Thus the first rule of the game of Chronograms is that every letter stands for its own numerical value, neither more nor less ; and this we perceive is part of the nature of the case ; it cannot be otherwise. The only other rule, more arbitrary, but equally rigid, is that every letter in the sentence of any numerical value *must* be counted, and it is in the strict observ-

ance of this rule that the art and mystery of chronogram making consists. It is something like the game of Patience. If we are merely arranging cards upon a table, there is no moral obliquity in placing a Red Queen upon a Red King, or a Black Knave on a Black Queen; only if we are playing Patience, we have tacitly undertaken not to do it. So, in the game of Chronograms, in the sentence we have selected or composed we are bound to use every letter which has a numerical signification, and if we miss one out, our chronogram is imperfect.

Chronograms may be composed in any language which uses our alphabet, and although the vast majority of extant chronograms are in Latin, they are to be found in Dutch, Flemish, German, and French, and occasionally though very rarely in English.

In chronograms J and U have the values of I and V and are frequently so printed. The letter W is not used in Latin, but it does occur in German, Dutch, and Flemish, and when it appears in a chronogram it equals 10, i.e. a double U as its name tells us.

In Flemish and Dutch chronograms the letter Y is sometimes used as equivalent to II (2). On the other hand, some Flemish chronogram-makers did not use the letter D or 500.

Many Latin words are entirely chronogrammatic, that is, every letter counts; such are *dux, dum, lux, &c.*, and some longer words such as *uvidum, diluvium, diluculum*.

Nearly all chronograms are concerned with the year of the Christian era, and it is therefore obvious that one great difficulty in composing them is to keep the numerical total from coming out too high. Thus if the composer of a chronogram wishes to give a date anywhere between 1000 and 2000 A.D., he cannot use more than one M, and when that M has been used he cannot introduce more than one D, as two D's would bring the total up to 2000 at once. Makers of

chronograms have tried to get over this difficulty by the invention of what are known as Duplex or Triplex Chronograms. In these when the sentence or verse they had composed or selected contained too many high numerals they would arrange it so as to bring the total to exactly twice or three times the number required. Thus if the date wanted was 1725, they would make a total of 3450 or 5175. This would give room for more M's and D's, but, strictly speaking, is an evasion of the rule and has the further disadvantage of requiring some indication that the chronogram is of a special kind. This is usually done by printing the words Duplex or Triplex in italics at the end of the line.

When did chronograms originate and what is the actual date of the earliest known ?

Mr. Hilton in his first volume mentions one in Hebrew of the year 1208. In his second volume he says : ' There are ' questionable examples in Latin of the year 1210 and of the ' year 1382, but it is not until about the middle of the fifteenth ' century, that we can feel safe in accepting any as genuine.' But in the Hebrew alphabet every letter has a numerical signification, therefore in a Hebrew chronogram every letter would have to be used. Personally I believe that it was the invention of the art of printing that produced the chronogram, or, if it did not produce it, contributed more than anything else to its widespread development. On the other hand, it is quite possible that the system was introduced into western Europe by some of the learned Jews, who became converts to the Christian Church before the invention of printing. These men would have been familiar with the Hebrew cabala, and might have derived from that the idea of introducing something of the kind into European languages, especially into Latin, the universal language of the learned.

Whether chronograms were derived from the cabala or not, it is quite certain that their industrious composers eagerly

took up the cabalistic system as adapted to the Latin alphabet, for most books of chronograms are full of cabalistic puzzles of the most curious and complicated character.

But this, as Mr. Kipling would say, 'is another story', and interesting and fascinating as it is, considerations of space prevent any treatment of it here. We must now turn from the origin of chronograms to the consideration of the place or places where the art was mostly cultivated.

I have mentioned previously that chronograms may be found in Dutch, Flemish, and German, as well as in Latin, more rarely in French and English and very seldom in Italian. The most prolific soils were the States of the Empire, i.e. Austria, Bavaria, Bohemia, and the Netherlands, and the most fruitful periods were the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Although it would be untrue to say that the making of chronograms was an exclusively Catholic recreation, it is undoubtedly the fact that the majority of chronogrammatic books and tracts came from the Catholic States. The Jesuits especially were very great at chronograms, and for nearly two hundred years they poured forth an almost continuous stream of chronogrammatic comment on public events, such as wars, treaties of peace, births, marriages, and deaths in the imperial family, coronations, enthronements of bishops, and ecclesiastical appointments and promotions of all kinds. Some of these are very elaborate indeed, and the time, labour, and ingenuity bestowed upon them must have been very great.

There are two main divisions into one of which all chronograms will fall. They must be either original or adapted. The first class is of course very much the larger, for it includes all those composed to commemorate public events or tributes of praise to some king, prince, or bishop, to which I have just alluded. The other class consists, not of sentences or verses composed expressly for the occasion, but of quotations, sometimes lines or half-lines from Virgil or other Latin poets but

more often from the sacred writings. The Vulgate Bible was indeed an inexhaustible quarry. The historical books, the Prophets, but most of all, the Psalter, were all searched for quotations from which chronograms could be extracted, and some quite singular results were obtained.

It has been somewhat fancifully said that the sculptor does not really make the statue which he produces from the block of marble; he merely hews away the superfluous material and reveals the figure which has been concealed in the block ever since the marble existed. In like manner it must have seemed almost miraculous to the laborious composer of chronograms, when the very date which he was desirous of celebrating presented itself to him in some familiar sentence of the Psalms or Gospels, which had been repeated in the services of the Church for centuries.

Here, for instance, is a good specimen of a chronogram adopted from the Psalter.

It consists of the first four words of the nineteenth Psalm (Prayer Book version, in the Vulgate it would be the eighteenth): *Coeli enarrant gloriam Dei*. The heavens declare the glory of God. Treated chronographically thus:

COELI ENARRANT GLORIAM DEI

the date comes out as 1703.

What a very appropriate motto for a student of astronomy to have put over his door, if he happened to have been building his house or observatory in that year. Sir Isaac Newton might have done it. But chronograms were not popular in England in his days. Addison ridicules them in the third dialogue of his *Essay on Medals* as follows:

But before we quit the legends of Medals, I cannot but take notice of a kind of wit that flourishes very much on many of the modern (i.e. Medals), especially those of Germany, when they represent in the inscription the year in which they were coined. As to mention to you another of Gustavus Adolphus

CHRISTUS DUX ERGO TRIUMPHUS

If you take the pains to pick out the figures from the several words, and range them in their proper order, you will find the amount of 1627, the year in which the medal was coined ; for do you not observe, some of the letters distinguish themselves from the rest, and top it over their fellows, these you must consider in a double capacity, as letters or ciphers. Your laborious German wits will turn you over a whole dictionary for one of these ingenious devices. You would fancy perhaps, they were searching after an apt classical term, but instead of that they are looking out a word that has an L, an M or a D in it. When therefore you see any of these inscriptions, you are not so much to look in them for the thought, as for the year of our Lord. There are foreign universities where this kind of wit is so much in vogue, that as you praise a man in England, for being an excellent philosopher or poet, it is an ordinary character among them to be a great chronogrammatist.

This passage, however, proves that Addison did not take the trouble to understand the system he was laughing at, for he makes the date, as the reader will probably have noticed, to be 1627, whereas it really works out 1632.

A later eighteenth-century wit, Richard Owen Cambridge, the friend of Johnson and Reynolds, has a contemptuous reference to chronograms in his now wellnigh forgotten satirical poem *The Scribleriad* (1750) :

Not thus the looser Chronograms prepare,  
Careless their Troops, undisciplined to War ;  
With ranks irregular, confus'd they stand,  
The Chieftains mingling with the vulgar band.

*Scribleriad*, Book II, 157-60.

Original chronograms are of two kinds, simple or complex. A chronogram may be called simple when it is merely a chronogram and nothing else, like those already quoted about Gustavus Adolphus. Complex chronograms are those which are combined with acrostics, anagrams, retrograde verses, and all kinds of magic squares, circles, or triangles, or with an extremely complicated and difficult form called a Logogryph.

Having done my best to answer the question, What are Chronograms ? I will try to answer the question which next arises, namely, where to find them.



Sculptured or inscribed chronograms are not to be met with frequently in England. Mr. James Hilton mentions a few in his books, some old ones and a few by modern revivers of the art. The only modern chronogrammatic inscription on a building which I have come across is on the new buildings of Oriel College in the High Street, Oxford. It runs as follows :

E LARGA MUNIFICENTIA CAECILII RHODES

and gives the date 1911.

The nearest one which the London student of chronograms can examine is in Westminster Abbey on the monument of Ludovic Stuart, Duke of Richmond and Lennox, a cousin of King James I.

The inscription contains this chronogram to mark the date, 1623 :

AN IGNORATIS QUIA PRINCEPS ET VIR MAGNUS OBIIIT HODIE

This is a very free adaptation of the words of David in the third chapter of the second book of Samuel, where he bewails the death of Abner, but the text has been considerably altered in order to keep down the total. As I have already pointed out, this is the great difficulty which besets the maker of chronograms. In the Vulgate the exact words are : ' Num ignoratis quoniam princeps et maximus cecidit hodie ' , and if treated chronogrammatically this would work out as 5333. Any number of chronograms may be found in printed books in the British Museum. It would, however, be a very long and laborious task to search the catalogue for books containing chronograms, but readers have been saved this labour by the industry of the late Mr. James Hilton, the author of those three bulky books on chronograms to which I have already confessed my indebtedness, for Mr. Hilton has very thoughtfully given the press-marks of all the Museum books he has described. I propose to give very brief descriptions of some of the books he has mentioned, all of which I have examined personally. The first which I shall describe

(837. k. 13) is a thin quarto of about 150 pages entitled *Annus Sexagesimus hujus saeculi . . . 1660*. It is the work of a Jesuit named Gerard Grumsel and contains no fewer than 2,068 hexameter and pentameter lines composed entirely in chronogram, commemorating the notable events of the year, every couplet giving the date 1660.

The subject is treated in ten poems called elegies on historical events, and the seventh elegy consisting of 262 lines relates to the Restoration of King Charles II.

The title-page contains the brief and simple chronogram :

AUCTORE GERARDO GRUMSEL S. J = 1661

Another very remarkable and beautiful book is a folio entitled *Conceptus Chronographicus*, published at Augsburg in 1712. The author was Joseph Zoller, a Benedictine, an exceedingly ingenious chronogrammatist. It begins with an engraved frontispiece, representing the Virgin Mary in an aureole, surrounded by seven angels holding shields, each bearing a chronogram. At the base is the red dragon supporting a scroll repeating the chronogram with which the title-page commences. The whole design is intended to illustrate verses 1-4 of the twelfth chapter of the book of the Revelation of St. John the Divine.

The title-page is printed in great letters, black and red, and the first words are chronogrammatic.

The book contains altogether 713 chronograms on one and the same subject, and repeating the one date 1712. Its purpose is the assertion and exaltation of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. It is altogether in Latin. It is divided into one hundred chapters or groups, and each of them is divided into seven sections in a set order, forming a remarkable collection of Fable, Legend, History, Divinity, Doctrine, &c. Each section is preceded by an appropriate chronogram ; each seventh section ends with an anagram on the words of the angelic salutation ' Ave Maria, gratia plena Dominus tecum '.

This, however, has no chronographic signification, yet shows that the author overcame one hundred additional difficulties in completing his work. An emblematic engraving accompanies the 'symbolum' or fifth section of each 'conceptus', which is explained by verses and references to texts of Scripture.

The preface contains some words having the appearance of a chronogram, but which are not intended to make any date; they are a playful alliterative application of the letters in the word 'cui', meaning the Emperor Charles VI then reigning, who is highly extolled in the preface.

The volume consists of 353 pages and concludes with the two words 'Immaculata Conceptio', arranged in the form of a magic square.

The next book I will mention (8610. b. 28) is a very curious one entitled *Ludus Fortunae*, by John Sturmius, Louvain, 1633. This contains a number of chronograms, mostly yielding the dates 1632, 1633, or 1634, combined with retrograde verses, that is, verses which can be read backwards as well as forwards.

Of the example here quoted Hilton writes: 'The first sixteen lines, it will be seen, are ordinary chronograms in hexameter and pentameter verse, and if the writer had gone no further his performance would call for no special remark; but when the next sixteen lines are carefully observed, the very words of the first sixteen lines, with a very few small alterations, can be read in fairly good metre in reversed order. They are printed as Chronograms in the original, but that need not be repeated here. The sense of the words, the writer tells us, are just the opposite of the first set of verses. The second set of lines are printed here in the ordinary manner. The subject is concerning peace or war in Europe at the date made by the chronograms which is 1633, about the middle of the Thirty Years War.'

Here are the two sets of verses :

VATICINIUM  
SEU

CARMEN CHRONOG: DE PACE,

In oppositu sensu Retrogradum, pro anno 1633

Opinio loquitur, utinam vera !

VatICInor bona, non beLLans hIC LabItVr annVs  
paCIfer est VenIens, non MaLa ContrIbVIt.  
proVenIet neqVe paX gentes hIC rIsert : anno  
fIt praesente InIens, haVD patrlae orDo Deest.  
paX rata neC fera faX assat pLena horrea : Cessant  
tYMpana, neC CantVs fLat tVba terrICrepos.  
terrIgenIs bona Dans est, non hos proterIt annVs :  
proDerIt hIs VenIens paX, neqVe DefICiet.  
agrlCoLIs faVet, haVD frVCtVs hIs DestrVIt annVs :  
VoLVItVr hVC popVLIs paX neqVe reICItVr.  
IIs flet neqVe paX gentes has DeserIt : annVs  
frVglfer It Labens, non MaLe terrIgenIs.  
est sat CLara neqVe est anCeps paX : ILICo flet  
DIXero, non sors hInC proLICenDa retro est.  
ContrIbVIt bona non beLLans hIC LabItVr annVs :  
paCIfer est VenIens, non MaLa VatICInor.

Suspicio respondet, utinam falsae

Vaticinor mala, non veniens est pacifer : annus  
Labitur hic bellans, non bona contribuit  
Est retro proicienda hinc sors, non dixero, fiet  
Illico : Pax anceps est, neque clara sat est.  
Terrigenis male, non labens it frugifer annus :  
Deserit has gentes Pax, neque fiet iis.  
Reiicitur, neque Pax populis huc volvitur : annus  
Destruit his fructus, haud favet agricolis.  
Deficiet, neque Pax veniens his proderit : annus  
Proterit hos, non est dans bona terrigenis.  
Terricrepos tuba flat cantus, nec tympana cessant :  
Horrea plena, assat fax fera nec rata Pax,  
Deest ordo patriae, haud iniens praesente fit anno :  
Riserit hic gentes Pax, neque proveniet.  
Contribuit mala, non veniens est pacifer annus :  
Labitur hic bellans, non bona vaticinor.

But if any one wants a supply of chronograms, cabalas acrostics, anagrams, and such-like, to employ his leisure hours for some considerable time, let him take out the following three volumes.

The first is a thick folio, which is lettered *Franconia Plaudens* (4885. f. 1). It is a volume of forty-eight tracts bound together, of various dates, some of them probably of great rarity, forming a collection of congratulatory odes, orations, &c., addressed to the bishops of Bamberg and Würzburg in Franconia, on their accession to dignity and office, expressed in an extraordinary variety of ingenious conceits such as cabalas, logogryphs, chronograms, &c. They mostly emanate from the Society of Jesuits at those places. There are also some very curious engravings. The chronograms vary in date from 1632 to 1779.

The next volume, lettered *Franconia Lugens* (4885. f. 3), is a companion to this, containing twenty tracts of various dates, bewailing the deaths of bishops of the same sees. The third, lettered *Fulda Plaudens et Plangens* (4885. f. 2), combines the characters of the other two volumes, containing twenty-five tracts of various dates, expressive of rejoicings at the election of some of the abbots of Fulda, and lamentations on their deaths. During the period thus celebrated, Fulda was raised to the dignity of a bishopric, and Abbot Amandus was made the first bishop in 1753. The book contains hundreds of chronograms, cabalas, anagrams, and puzzles of all kinds.

I may now describe two books in my own collection, both of which are remarkable in their way. The first is entitled *Prolusiones Chrono-Emblematicae in mortem Augustissimae Imperatricis Margaritae*. This Margaret was the first wife of the Emperor Leopold I.

The book was written, as we gather from the chronogrammatic title-page, by Count Francis Christopher Talmberg,

and was published at Prague in 1673. It is probably extremely rare, and most likely only a few copies were printed for distribution to the members of the imperial family.

This book must at one time have belonged to the late Mr. James Hilton as it has his name in it with the date 1889, but it is no longer, alas, in the condition in which he describes it.

The engraved frontispiece, the dedicatory address to the Emperor Leopold, and the large engraving, 13 by 10½ inches, representing the horoscope of the Empress and full of chronograms, had all vanished when I rescued it from a barrow in the Farringdon Road.

Enough, however, remains to make it an extremely curious and interesting volume.

The plan of the book is to represent under the expression 'Annulus Doloris or the Mourning Ring', in a series of allegorical engravings and enigmas, the extravagant grief of the Emperor's Bohemian subjects.

The Mourning Ring (of great size) appears in the first engraving with this inscription round the circle :

EN ANNULUM DOLORIS UNIVERSALIS = 1673

Margarita (the Pearl) has fallen out of the setting and lies on the ground.

There is a very curious chronogrammatic acrostic on the first page, each line making the date 1673 and beginning with one of the syllables of the line 'En annulum doloris universalis' seen on the engraving of the Mourning Ring.

Seven months after the death of the Empress Margaret Leopold married his cousin Claudia and on her death in 1676 he married a third wife.

He was a great lover of acrostics, anagrams, chronograms, epigrams, and such-like literary devices, and at different periods of his life made some very good ones. For example, when his second wife died he made the following

simple and effective chronogram to be inscribed on her tomb :

HIC JACET CLAUDIA LEOPOLDI CAESARIS CONJUX = 1676

The other book in my possession is a small quarto of 292 pages, printed at Alost in East Flanders in 1784. The title-page reads : *Poemata Chronometra, Anagrammata Epigrammata et Alia his affinia* (Device) *in monte Parnasso, Typis Musicis*. The author was a monk of Ninove, near Alost, named Van Halen. The book is made up of congratulatory addresses, jubilee odes, letters and verses on various occasions ; principally on university or cathedral appointments. It contains an immense number of chronograms interspersed with acrostics, anagrams, cabalas, logogryphs, and other devices, such as long epistles in which every word begins with the same letter. But its main characteristic is the number of long chronograms in prose and verse in which letters of a low numerical value only are used. For instance there is one consisting of two pages in close print in prose with a total of only 1775. The only numerical letters employed are I, U or V, and X, that is to say that no word containing the letters C, D, L, or M, occurs in the whole two pages. The total is made up thus :

$$\begin{array}{rcl} 16 & X & = 160 \\ 263 & U \text{ or } V & = 1315 \\ 300 & I & = 300 \\ & & 1775 \end{array}$$

There are three of these in prose besides others in verse.

One of the most curious things in the book is a version of the well-known hymn 'Dies Irae'.

All the seventeen stanzas are rendered chronogrammatic by a number of verbal alterations, which do not, however, destroy the identity of the hymn, and all the original rhymes are preserved, though not always with the identical words. Every stanza gives the date 1773.



The reader may like to see one or two specimens :

Dies Irae DIes ILLa	=	1104
solVet saeC'La In faVILLa	=	312
CanUnt psaLtes aC sIbILLa	=	357
		1773
Inter oVes seDes praesta	=	506
aC ab haeDIIs nos seqUestra	=	606
LoCans nos In parte DeXtra	=	661
		1773

and so on, through the whole seventeen stanzas.

The greater part of the book is in Latin, but there are letters and verses in French, Dutch, and Flemish. At the end is a large folding page with a quintuple acrostic. This is very ingenious but not chronogrammatic.

I have mentioned several times a sort of puzzle called a logogryph, which is very often combined with a chronogram, and I will now give the reader a specimen.

A logogryph consists of two lines of verse or prose containing certain syllables, common to both, and it is so arranged that these syllables, being printed between the lines, can be read into either the upper or the lower line.

One would think that they would be difficult enough to compose, simply by themselves, but to make them chronogrammatic in addition must add very much to the complexity of the problem.

This one is taken from the volume in the British Museum lettered *Franconia Plaudens* which I have previously mentioned; at page 14 of Tract No. 11 an ode about Bishop Frederick Charles of Bamberg and the Lion of Judah concludes with this hexameter logogryph chronogram :

VeL    saLM    VIgILanDO sat UngU fo  
       Leo        onJs                                e    VebIs = 1729

aUt    saMs    sUaVI et DULCIor    fa  
 each line comes to 1729 including the intermediate letters.

Space does not permit the introduction of any more specimens of these puzzles and curiosities, but the supply of them is practically inexhaustible. Mr. Hilton's three volumes alone contain something like 15,000 chronograms, &c., and he has only made selections from a vast number. Most of the books referred to contain innumerable cabalas as well as chronograms, but this branch of the subject must be left for another opportunity.

I will conclude by quoting the only chronogram which I have come across in a modern English book.

This occurs in the *Catalogue of St. Paul's Cathedral Library*, compiled by the late Rev. W. Sparrow Simpson, D.D., Sub-dean and Librarian of St. Paul's (London: Elliot Stock, 1893). On the unnumbered page succeeding page 255 there is the following inscription:

CataLogUs LIbrorUM eCCLeSiae

s. paVLI

eXpLICIt feLICItEr

In Ipso

beatI paVLI

patronI nostrI festo.

= 1893

I have tried to compose a chronogram for the Bibliographical Society, but the best I can do is:

THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY, MAY IT FLOURISH AND  
BE EVER VIGILANT = 1923

I hope it may.

## REVIEWS

*Portuguese Bibliography.* By AUBREY F. G. BELL. Humphrey Milford : Oxford University Press, 1922. 10s. 6d. net.

WITH the publication of his *Portuguese Literature* (Oxford, 1922), Mr. Aubrey Bell performed a service for Portugal similar to that which Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly had already done for Spain ; and it is gratifying to note that this country has now provided the *Baedeker* for both Spanish and Portuguese literature. It remained for Mr. Bell to complete his service by publishing the bibliography already written to accompany his history of the literature, after the model of the bibliography appended to the French and Spanish translations of Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly's *History of Spanish Literature*. This *Portuguese Bibliography* has now appeared as one of the volumes in the Portuguese series of the *Hispanic Notes and Monographs* published by the Hispanic Society of America.

Like its prototype, Mr. Bell's bibliography is divided into seven sections. In the present case these are : General Works ; Texts ; Anthologies ; Folk-Lore, Popular Poetry, &c. ; Portuguese Language ; Dictionaries ; Authors. The last section, which records the best editions of, and studies on, all authors worth mentioning in Portuguese literature, has its counterpart in Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly's book. Here it forms about two-thirds of the whole work. The excellent idea of including sections on 'Portuguese Language' and 'Dictionaries' is Mr. Bell's own. The other sections call attention to the fact that while Portuguese is rich in popular poetry, and not lacking in plays, it cannot match the abundant dramatic and ballad literature of Castilian. Though small in size, the volume runs to close on four hundred pages, and represents an enormous labour expended by its author, and a corresponding labour saved for

the student, who can now take the shortest of cuts to the best authorities on any point in Portuguese literature that interests him, or proceed to develop a theme with a full knowledge at the outset of everything of moment that has already been written on the subject. And it should be noted that Mr. Bell includes Galician and Brazilian literature in his survey.

English names occur with modest frequency throughout the work, though the list begins with the name of John Adamson of Newcastle, and almost ends with that of Mr. Edgar Prestage, who nobly bears this country's burden on his stalwart shoulders. That burden, however, would have looked lighter if Mr. Bell were not suffering from an acute attack of *autonomatophobia*—as common among the youth as it is rare among men of letters. The student who wishes to consult any of the excellent modern works entered anonymously in this bibliography may save time by risking the assumption that they are by the bibliographer himself.

H. T.

*The Fleuron : a journal of typography.* Edited by OLIVER SIMON. Number one. London : at the office of *The Fleuron*. 1923. pp. viii, 128. Price One Guinea.

ENGLISH periodicals devoted to the technique of printing have hitherto left a good deal to be desired in matters of taste and judgement and we wish *The Fleuron* and its staff every success in their effort to do better. A sufficiently good start is made in this first number to justify confidence in the ability of those responsible for it to make it a valuable influence in the improvement of English printing if adequate support is forthcoming, and any one a little daunted at being asked to pay a guinea for a single number should remember that the higher the aims of its projectors, the more difficult will it be to obtain the ordinary trade advertisements on which most technical journals rely for a large proportion of their income. The advertisements in *The Fleuron* are as interesting and as carefully set forth as the text, and the publishers' maintenance

of a high standard in this respect gives them a strong claim to support.

The most important article in this first number is that by Francis Meynell and Stanley Morison, on 'Printers' Flowers and Arabesques', with illustrations in line and collotype. The precise and immediate origin of these ornaments has not been cleared up, even in this article, but the writers give ocular demonstration of the correctness of the belief that they must be derived from the Persian and Arabesque designs which found their way into Europe through Venice and left their earliest evidence in Venetian bindings. Many useful data are brought together in the article and liberally illustrated, and it ought to form the starting-point of further research.

Mr. Percy Smith contributes another interesting article on 'Initial Letters in the Printed Book', and to this are appended numerous examples, some of which tempt us to hope that the excellent blocks used in Dr. Oscar Jennings's unsatisfactory book (*Early Woodcut Initials*) have at last got into good hands. Mr. Oliver Simon, the editor, writes on 'The Title-page', with an appendix of some interesting modern examples which are used as illustrations of a proposed classification of styles. Mr. Herbert Simon has a note on Printers' Marks, also with modern examples. Professor Rothenstein contributes an appreciation of Mr. Cobden Sanderson and his work; Mr. Holbrook Jackson writes on 'Claude Lovat Fraser: illustrator' and in the course of his paper describes the genesis of the 'Flying Fame' chapbooks and broadsides which were winning considerable success when the war brought them to a close; Mr. Updike tells of the recovery of 'the "lost" Caslon specimen of 1748'. It will be seen that much ground has been covered in this first number and the titles of some of the articles will probably reappear with some frequency in the future. We hope *The Fleuron* may live and thrive and help to bring back the pleasure of beautiful decoration to modern bookwork. At

present there is little encouragement for good designers and when good designs are wanted it is not easy to find any one to make them.

*Monotype: a journal of composing-room efficiency.* Vol. 9, No. 6. Published by the Lanston Monotype Machine Company. F. L. RUTLEDGE, Editor. Philadelphia, U.S.A., 1923. January-February.

THE contents of this double-number are (1) a paper on Private Presses in England, made up of a chapter from Holbrook Jackson's 'The Eighteen Nineties', with introductions and additions by another hand, and (2) a note on Claude Garamond, by W. M. Ivins, jun. Its final cause is to show the beauty of a trial fount of Garamond's design made by Mr. Frederic W. Goudy. We are told that with the exception of the illustrations, initials, and two enlargements of the word 'Monotype' the issue is printed directly from Monotype material throughout, and the result is to prove once again that the most beautiful results can be obtained from modern labour-saving devices, when these are devised and applied with fine craftsmanship. Mr. Goudy's types, roman and italic, are beautiful in themselves and Mr. Bruce Rogers has handled them with a skill which makes the pamphlet one of the most perfect masterpieces he has ever produced. His own 'Printer's Note' which brings the number to a close is charmingly written, ending with the remark that 'as an authority once said I was "still to be reckoned a limited edition man" I must bear out his classification, and incidentally give this note the characteristic colophonical flavor, by stating that this issue of "Monotype" printed from type that will be destroyed (not distributed) after printing, is limited to 20,000 copies'. The number is alarming. It is precisely editions of 20,000 copies (and over) that in the past have disappeared almost as utterly as hornbooks. It is to be hoped that some of the 20,000 will fall into the hands of book-lovers, who will treasure them as they deserve.

*Autograph Prices Current.* (Published annually.) Being a record of autograph letters, documents, and manuscripts, and illuminated manuscripts, sold by auction in London. Compiled and edited by A. J. HERBERT. Volume VI. A. J. Herbert, 1 Barton Street, Westminster. pp. viii, 284. Price 25s. net.

THIS sixth volume of *Autograph Prices Current* covers the period August 1921 to July 1922 for autographs, while for illuminated manuscripts goes back to July 1919, and so embraces three eventful years during which many splendid manuscripts came into the market, including the last (we hope it will continue to be the last) of Mr. Yates Thompson's sales. Though the autographs recorded represent only the dispersals of a single twelvemonth, they also are extraordinarily numerous and interesting. Blake, Borrow, Browning, Burns, Carlyle, Cowper, Dickens, Garrick, Leigh Hunt, Johnson, Nelson, Pope, Scott, Shelley, Stevenson, Horace Walpole, Whistler, and Wordsworth, are all well represented, and the collections of letters by Carlyle to Mill and by Johnson to Sir Robert Chambers were especially interesting and noteworthy. It might be wished that some of the smaller entries of bits of writing by quite modern authors could have been ignored, and it is specially unpleasant to the present writer to think of diaries of Frederick Locker and bundles of letters to him from his friends being hawked about for a few pounds. But the catalogue as a whole has the perennial human interest which gives to the records of sales of autographs a charm which similar records of books (in print or manuscript) seldom possess, while it offers some not entirely cynical amusement in the small prices fetched by the letters of philosophers and statesmen, historians, and even men of science as compared with those of actors and authors whose personality has a more popular appeal.

A. W. P.



## AN EXHIBITION OF TWENTIETH-CENTURY PRINTED BOOKS

THE Directors of the Medici Society have arranged at their Galleries (7 Grafton Street, Bond Street) a very interesting exhibition of 422 books printed and published during the last two decades 'for the most part in the ordinary circumstances of business', all of which reach a respectable standard of craftsmanship, while some are as good as books can be. Two hundred and forty-three of the exhibits are from English presses; the rest give a fair idea of the better work done in recent years in the United States, France, Germany, and Spain, while five other countries are more thinly represented. Somehow or other the first Illustrated Monograph issued by this Society, Mr. Redgrave's *Erhard Ratdolt and his work at Venice*, though printed in 1894, has found its way into this twentieth-century exhibition, and holds its own very well. But the general impression the exhibition must make on any one familiar with the bookwork of the 'nineties is that good craftsmanship is now much more widely spread, and printers who do specially good work receive quicker recognition by publishers and other book-builders. The exhibition will remain open throughout June and it is to be hoped that many members of the Bibliographical Society and other book-lovers will visit it.

A. W. P.